THE Lutheran Quarterly

me IX MAY, 1957 Number 2

Office of Publication, 18 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly*, founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review*, founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly*, Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, books for review to the Book Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription $2.75 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor
THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Managing Editor
A. J. ENGELBRECHT
1250 Nowata St., Dubuque, Iowa

Book Editor
WARREN A. QUANBECK
2245 Luther Place, St. Paul 8, Minnesota

Circulation Manager
PAUL M. LINDBERG
Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
GETTYSBURG, PA.

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
COLUMBUS, OHIO

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
DUBUQUE, IOWA

LUTHER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ST. PAUL, MINN.

AUGSBURG SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

CENTRAL SEMINARY
FREMONT, NEB.

CHICAGO LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MAYWOOD, ILL.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SEMINARY OF CANADA
WATERLOO, ONT.

GRANDVIEW SEMINARY
DES MOINES, IOWA

HAMMA DIVINITY SCHOOL
SPRINGFIELD, OHIO

LUTHERAN SEMINARY
SASKATOON, SASK.

NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

SOUTHERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
COLUMBIA, S. C.

SUOMI SEMINARY
HANCOCK, MICH.

TRINITY SEMINARY
BLAIR, NEB.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN SEMINARY
BERKELEY, CALIF.

AIMS AND POLICY

I. *Aim:* The aim of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.

II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume IX MAY, 1957 No. 2

PACIFIC LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY THE LIBRARY

CONTENTS

THE LIVING CHURCH ..... *Willard D. Allbeck* 99

THE CHURCHES AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS ..... *M. A. F. Ritchie* 110

REFLECTIONS ON DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE ..... *G. H. Hoffman* 125

PREACHING TO YOUNG PEOPLE ..... *F. Leslie Conrad, Jr.* 144

THE BEGINNING OF JESUS' MINISTRY IN LUKE ..... *Eric H. Wahlstrom* 151

WHAT MAKES GOOD HYMNS? ..... *L. David Miller* 154

DESERT WISDOM: THE SAYINGS OF THE ANCHORITES ... *Edwin C. Tappert* 157

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Telfer, ed., *The Library of Christian Classics,* IV (E. L. Fevold) 173
Tappert, ed., *The Library of Christian Classics,* XVIII (J. W. Rilling) 173
Verduin & Wenger, eds., *Complete Writings of Menno Simons* (S. A. Rand) 174
Ferm, ed., *Puritan Sage: Writings of Jonathan Edwards* (R. H. Fischer) 176
Jor, *Søren Kierkegaard* (R. Thomte) 176
Berdyaev, *The Meaning of the Creative Act* (C. W. Kegley) 179
Spinka, *The Church in Soviet Russia* (W. D. Allbeck) 180
Lake, *Story of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.* (E. L. Fevold) 181
Jurji, *The Christian Interpretation of Religion* (H. W. Johnson) 181
Hill, *Ethics in Theory and Practice* (W. H. K. Narum) 182
Kraeling, *Rand McNally Bible Atlas* (E. E. Flack) 182
The Interpreter's Bible. Volume II (V. P. Faillettaz) 183
Stevenson, *Preaching on the Books of the New Testament* (H. F. Baughman) 184
Beck, *Why I Am a Lutheran* (A. C. Rueter) 185
Austin, *Come as You Are* (A. C. Rueter) 186
Bryant, *Climbing the Heights. Daily Devotions* 186
Tenney, *The New Testament: a Survey* (T. S. Liefeld) 186
Rowlingson, *Introduction to New Testament Study* (J. Reumann) 187
Bewer, *The Prophets* (J. V. Halvorson) 188
Lowe, *Saint Peter* (E. E. Flack) 189
Vos, *The Teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (J. P. Milton) 189
Wedel, *The Pulpit Rediscovers Theology* (T. Heimarck) 190
Read, *The Christian Faith* (E. J. Erlandson) 190
Shaw, *Christian Doctrine* (G. F. Schott) 191
Snaith, *The Jews From Cyrus to Herod* (R. W. Jenson) 191
Jones, *Mastery* (M. S. Molvik) 192

CONTRIBUTORS

WILLARD D. ALLBECK is professor of Historical Theology in Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio.

M. A. F. RITCHIE was chairman of the Department of Human Relations in the University of Miami, Coral Gables, Fla., before he was made president of Hartwick College, Oneonta, N. Y.

G. H. HOFFMAN is pastor of St. Luke's Church (A.L.C.) in La Mesa, Calif.

LESLIE CONRAD, JR., is executive secretary of the Luther League of America, youth organization of the United Lutheran Church.

ERIC H. WAHLSTROM is professor of the New Testament in Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Ill.

L. DAVID MILLER is director of the School of Music in Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio.

EDWIN C. TAPPERT is master in the Classics in Salisbury School, Salisbury, Conn.

Among the reviewers of books in this number are EUGENE L. FEVOLD, professor of Church History in Luther Seminary, St. Paul; JOHN W. RILLING, pastor of St. John's Church (U.L.C.) in Minneapolis; SIDNEY A. RAND, executive secretary of the Department of Education, Evangelical Lutheran Church; ROBERT H. FISCHER, professor of Church History in the Chicago Lutheran Seminary, Maywood, Ill.; REIDAR THOMTE, professor of Philosophy in Concordia College, Moorhead, Minn.; CHARLES W. KEGLEY, professor of Philosophy in Wagner College, Staten Island, N. Y.; HJALMAR W. JOHNSON, professor of Systematic Theology in Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Ill.; WILLIAM H. K. NARUM, professor of Philosophy in St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn.; E. E. FLACK, dean of Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio; VERNON P. FAILLETTAZ, pastor of Bethel Church (E.L.C.) in Chicago; HARRY F. BAUGHMAN, president of the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Gettysburg, Pa.; A. C. RUETER, pastor of Bethany Church in Tulsa, Okla.; THEODORE S. LIEFELD, professor of the New Testament in Capital University Theological Seminary, Columbus, Ohio; JOHN REUMANN, assistant professor of the New Testament in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia; JOHN V. HALVORSON, professor of the Old Testament in Luther Seminary, St. Paul; JOHN P. MILTON, professor of the Old Testament in Luther Seminary, St. Paul; THEODORE HEIMARCK, pastor of the Church of the Good Shepherd, Minneapolis; E. J. ERLANDSON, pastor of St. Mark's Church in Walnut Creek, Calif.

The Living Church

By Willard D. Allbeck

DISCUSSIONS concerning the nature of the church often become fruitless because at the outset they start with unfortunate presuppositions. Unconsciously the concept of the church is structural instead of vital, stone instead of flesh. At this point there is a genuine difficulty: a living thing in movement is more difficult to depict in sharp outline. A living church likewise cannot be as sharply defined as is sometimes assumed. Instead it is to be recognized by certain indicators or signs as evidence of its presence, just as a Geiger counter indicates the presence of radiations and perhaps of uranium. What are these signs and what is the nature of the church thus indicated?

In the ecumenical mood of our time such a question has great importance. Emil Brunner says, "The question of the church is indeed the unsolved problem of Protestant theology."[1] The church has been defined with such varying emphases that there is agreement only on the broadest, and therefore the cloudiest, terms. Some sort of understanding of what the church is in essence becomes necessary every time groups of Christians consider their relation to one another. A special kind of necessity, produced by the prejudiced accusation that Lutherans wanted to destroy the church, resulted in the Confession signed and delivered at Augsburg in 1530 which affirmed that "the church is the congregation of saints in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments rightly administered."[2]

Here right quickly, if our minds are not hypnotized by the authority of the document, we see a problem. Why is the doctrine of the church stated in this way? The Lutheran Confessions are accepted as testimonies concerning the teachings of Scripture. Does the Augsburg Confession faithfully reflect the image of the church in Scripture? Since the Gospel is proclaimed and the sacraments are administered in public worship, is this description of the church a liturgical one?

1 *The Divine Imperative* (Philadelphia, 1947), p. 523.
2 Article VII.

If we call this statement of the Augsburg Confession a liturgical description we may thus alert our minds to its possible limitations, even its one-sidedness. In an address Wynne C. Boliek said recently, "The church is at its best when it is at worship." As we remember the present emphasis on stewardship in our congregations, might we not better say, "The church is at its best when it is heartily practicing stewardship"? Or in view of the renewed program of evangelism should the statement not read, "The church is at its best when it is evangelizing, when it is witnessing, when it is missionary to all nations"? In other words, is not a confessing church a more apt designation than a worshiping church? Is the Augsburg Confession's phrase typically sixteenth century and European rather than first century and Palestinian or even twentieth century and American?

Any discussion of the doctrine of the church is promptly confronted with our Lord's words in Matt. 16:18, "Upon this rock I will build my church." It is well known that evangelical Christians understand the "rock" to be Peter's confession in verse 16, "Thou art the Christ," whereas Roman Catholics understand the "rock" to be Peter himself. Oscar Cullmann reviews the present division of opinion among German scholars and indicates his agreement with the Catholic position.[3] On the other hand, those who take the usual Protestant position often get a mind-set from the word "build" whereby the church is an organizational structure. They think of it as a body with typical form and offices, and coming in the course of time to have established precedents and regulations. The connotations of the word "church" so built are organizational, just as is the case with the Roman Catholics. The concept is structural and static, so that even N. F. S. Grundtvig, a vigorous critic of ecclesiasticism, wrote a hymn beginning with the words,

> Built on the Rock the Church doth stand,
> Even when steeples are falling.

A church which is built, erected, established must of necessity have a form. And at once we are confronted with a definition of the church in terms of polity. Immediately there comes to mind the claims of episcopacy, papacy, presbyterianism, and congregationalism. These claims are accompanied by decisions concerning the functions and the

3 *Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr,* pp. 206 ff.

authority of the clergy—an important feature of organizational structure.

In reality, the decision as to polity is an answer to the question of authority in administration. No matter what name and title the administrator bears—bishop or elder, priest or pastor, or even, as in the Salvation Army, captain or general—the real issue concerns his functions and the power connected therewith. Beyond any question the scriptural functions of the ministry are those involving the Word and the sacraments. Preaching the Word includes the duty to "reprove, rebuke, exhort."[4] Stated in general terms, the work of the ministry is to "feed the church of God," as St. Paul said to the elders of Ephesus.[5] They were to be "overseers" in congregations where preaching, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper were so typically the church activity that there needed to be no special enumeration of them. Our Lord's command to Peter, "Feed my sheep,"[6] thus became the obligation of all elders who were to "labor in the word and doctrine."[7] Even when discipline became a function of the leaders of the church, the penalties assessed could be only those of exclusion from public worship (i.e., excommunication).

It is apparent, therefore, that church polity as an abstraction, as a mere theoretical formulation, is a misconception. The offices of the church are functional. They are a ministry. Brunner expresses his dislike for the word "office" in the church and prefers the word "service."[8] It was not the case that a pattern of church government was designed, with offices named and duties enumerated. No such legal blueprint existed in New Testament times. Instead, the leadership of the congregations was given the responsibility for directing the activities of the fellowship in an orderly way. Of these activities the regular Sunday worship was the most important.

The offices of the church, therefore, met the needs of the Christian community for worship. To emphasize polity, whether as the *esse* or the *bene esse* of the church, is to miss the point.[9] The fellowship in Word and sacrament was and is the heart of the matter. Polity is in

4 II Tim. 4:2.
5 Acts 20:28. Cf. I Peter 5:1.
6 John 21:16.
7 I Tim. 5:17.
8 Emil Brunner, *The Misunderstanding of the Church* (Philadelphia, 1953), p. 50.
9 Cf. Norman Sykes, *Old Priest and New Presbyter* (Cambridge, 1956), pp. 35 ff.

essence a liturgical concern, not one of ideal organizational structure. What is important is an orderly worshiping fellowship, not the titles and rank of the officers.

The advocates of episcopacy refer with enthusiasm to the epistles of Ignatius of Antioch written near the year A.D. 100. The recurrent theme of the epistles was unity in the local church, the people loyally following their bishop. What is not so often observed is the fact that the bishop's authority was chiefly liturgical. Notice again the well-known quotation from the Epistle to the Smyrnaeans, "Wherever the bishop appears, let the people be, just as wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the universal church. It is not permissible to baptize or hold a religious meal without the bishop, but whatever he approves is also pleasing to God so that everything you do may be secure and valid."[10] Ignatius did not omit the ministry of the Word, for he said, "So as children of the light of truth, flee from division and false teachings; follow like sheep where the pastor is."[11] But he combined Word and sacraments, saying, "If anyone holds alien views he does not support Christ's suffering. Be zealous therefore to practice giving of thanks, for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup in token of union in his blood, one altar, as well as one bishop with the board of elders and the deacons."[12]

It is worth observing that when Ignatius speaks of the church, he had in mind the local congregation. But we should keep clearly before us the fact that the word "church" may also mean the whole body of Christians. The New Testament has only one word, *ecclesia,* for these two concepts. *Ecclesia* is uniformly translated in the King James Version as "church" and in Luther's German Bible as "Gemeinde." To distinguish the two connotations the scholastics were accustomed to use the terms *ecclesia universalis* and *ecclesia particularis.* The first meaning is typical of Ephesians (e.g., 5:25, "Christ also loved the church and gave himself for it"). The second meaning, namely that of a congregation, even a very small one meeting in someone's home, is indicated by such a passage as I Cor. 16:19 ("The churches of Asia salute you. Aquila and Priscilla salute you much in the Lord, with the

10 8:2. Edgar J. Goodspeed, *The Apostolic Fathers* (New York, 1950), p. 230. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* (New York, 1890), I, 90. Hereafter cited as *ANF.*

11 To the Philadelphians, 2:1. Goodspeed, *op. cit.,* p. 225. *ANF,* I, 79.

12 *Ibid.,* 3:3, 4:1. Goodspeed, *op. cit.,* p. 225. *ANF,* I, 80 f. Cf. To the Smyrnaeans, 7:2; 8:1.

church that is in their house"). With either meaning it is a mistake to define the church primarily in terms of polity, for that would be to take a minor phase and make it a major concern.

Among Protestants there is more likely to be an emphasis upon the church as identified by pure doctrine. It is the church of the Gospel. It has the truth, the faith once for all delivered to the saints. It holds the true, orthodox doctrine without which none can be saved, as the Athanasian Creed affirms. What is taught and passed on from one generation to another is, as Luther's Small Catechism says, most certainly true. Even the Augsburg Confession declares that church unity must be based upon agreement concerning the doctrine of the Gospel.

But the essential point is that doctrine is an answer to the question of authority in teaching. It is concerned with preaching the Gospel. It is not an abstract intellectualizing pastime. Its primary purpose is not to produce a philosophical system in religion, or to erect a speculative structure of brilliant insights. Doctrine in the church should always be related to the living task of the church. Theology should be a framework for preaching. It should clarify and integrate what a confessing church is proclaiming. Theology as a mere intellectual edifice is lifeless. Doctrine as the well-considered understanding of the message is the detailed configuration of a dynamic reality. It contributes to life.

When the Augsburg Confession said, "Our churches with common consent do teach . . ." it was not telling the emperor and the estates what some theological professor had published in a book on dogmatics but was making explicit what was being said in church on Sunday morning. The doctrine articulated in the Confession was designed to preserve purely the Gospel message for homiletical purposes. Doctrine is in its essence therefore a liturgical matter. It is concerned with the ministry of the Word in public worship. To quote Regin Prenter, "Where the outward Word is to be the bearer of the Spirit of God it must come in the manner of preaching. In its essence the Gospel is always a message."[13] And Luther made this comment on Ps. 19:4, "Where the sound and the words of the Spirit are, there without doubt is the true church of Christ; for the Spirit of Christ does not speak except in his church."[14]

13 Regin Prenter, *Spiritus Creator,* trans. by John M. Jensen (Philadelphia, 1953), p. 117.
14 *Luthers Werke, Weimarer Ausgabe,* V, 547. Hereafter cited as *WA.*

Dynamic doctrine, living Word—that was what Luther was interested in. That, too, is ecumenical. Long centuries before Luther, Irenaeus had written about ". . . our faith which, having been received from the church, we preserve. . . . For this gift of God has been entrusted to the church as breath was to the first created man for this purpose that all the members receiving it may be vivified. . . . For where the church is, there is the spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the church and every kind of grace."[15] And in the same mood Origen of Alexandria wrote, "Since as a soul vivifies and moves the body, . . . so the Word, arousing and moving the whole body, the church, to befitting action, awakens moreover each individual member belonging to the church, so that they do nothing apart from the Word."[16]

All this was so important to Luther that he gave it especially strong expression in these words: "The Gospel is the single, most certain, and most noble mark of the church, more so than the Bread and Baptism."[17] It is not difficult to find other quotations from Luther in which he makes the presence of the Word of God an indication of the presence of the church.[18] When he wanted to state the matter more fully he said, "Where God's Word is, there must the church be; so also where Baptism and the Sacrament are, there must God's people be."[19]

This is precisely what Melanchthon wrote in the Augsburg Confession. Preaching the Word and administering the sacraments certainly indicates public worship, an overt, empirical realization of a spiritual fellowship. Edmund Schlink has said, "The congregation of believers cannot exist at all without Gospel and sacraments. Without preaching and sacraments it would dissolve into nothing and would never have arisen."[20] And Brunner says, "The formless church must issue in the 'congregation,' the assembly for worship." His name for the church is the "worshiping community."[21] For this reason we may speak of the phrase in the Augsburg Confession as liturgical.

15 *Against Heresies,* III, 24, 1. *ANF,* I, 458.
16 *Against Celsus,* VI, 48. *ANF,* IV, 595.
17 *WA,* VII, 721.
18 *WA,* L, 629; VIII, 491.
19 "On the Councils and the Churches," *Works of Martin Luther,* Philadelphia edition, V, 274. Hereafter cited as *WML. WA,* L, 631. Cf. Acts 10:42-48.
20 *The Nature of the Church,* R. Newton Flew, ed. (New York, 1952), p. 60.
21 *The Divine Imperative,* pp. 530 f.

If this adjective seems objectionable, it is surely an indication that it has been abused by being identified with formalism and rubrics. Melanchthon's phrase has nothing to do with liturgics, though it has everything to do with public worship. It is highly unfortunate that we cannot talk about the church at worship without getting involved in matters of vestments and acolytes and altar orientation. As Brunner has pointed out, the New Testament Greek words relating to worship have nothing to do with formalism. Yet the only suitable adjective referring to the church at worship is the word "liturgical." We must use it in spite of its odor.

The church at worship, the church of the Word and sacraments, is the living church. It is in touch with reality, with vitality. It is the assembly in which Christ is present. To quote Schlink again, "The church is constituted by the event of the preaching of the Gospel and the administering of the sacraments, and so by Christ himself acting through and present in Gospel and sacraments."[22] The size of the assembly is unimportant. Our Lord's words are, "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matt. 18:20). These words are most often used as a pious cover for the embarrassment of a small attendance. That is to miss the point. In Reinhold Seeberg's opinion, "Jesus anticipated a historical unfolding of the kingdom of God in the form of a congregation (*ecclesia*). In this congregation he will be present."[23] It is debatable whether or not Seeberg is correct in equating *ecclesia* with congregation. The church is both a spiritual fellowship and an empirical assembly. Brunner says of the New Testament Christians "that their cultic assembly for the common hearing of the Word, for the prayer of fellowship, and for the celebration of the sacrament served in a special way to make them increasingly aware of themselves as the *ecclesia,* as the people of God made one with Christ and knit together through him."[24] In Luther's words, "If the church teaches and baptizes, then Christ teaches and baptizes."[25] Or to quote him further, "We know of no other church than that which hears the voice of Christ and is baptized."[26]

22 *Op. cit.,* p. 61.
23 *Textbook of History of Doctrine* (Philadelphia, 1905), I, 34.
24 *The Misunderstanding of the Church,* p. 60.
25 *WA,* XXV, 277.
26 *WA,* XLVII, 218.

Vilmos Vajta has called attention to Luther's identification of faith and worship. As he states it, "The character of faith as communion with God belongs, according to the theology of Luther, not to an area within man but consists quite concretely in the divine service (*Gottesdienst*)."[27] Vajta would have us notice that when Luther interprets the First Commandment, he says that to have a god is to worship him. "Hence as soon as Luther speaks of God he speaks also of divine service (*Gottesdienst*)."[28] Vajta does not make the mistake of describing worship as a purely human act, but understands it as God's active presence to which man responds. Thus he says, "Revelation and divine service (*Gottesdienst*) are really one and the same reality: the communion of God and man under earthly conditions."[29]

The union of Christ and the church is depicted in organic terms in the Epistle to the Ephesians. God gave Christ "to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all" (1:22, 23). This is an organismic concept. The church is not simply people; it is people united to Christ, being nourished, sustained, controlled by him. The "fullness" (*pleroma*) that Ephesians mentions is pulsating, life-giving. St. John's Gospel declares that "of his fullness (*pleroma*) have we all received and grace for grace" (1:16). Thus it is customary for Lutherans to say that Christ communicates himself and his grace through Word and sacrament. That is an ecumenical view. A Roman Catholic writer has put it this way: "The church is therefore like Christ; the body is like the head. This homogeneity of the church with Christ, of the body with the head, enables Christ to be diffused and communicated in space and time. It assures a continuous presence of Christ in space and time. This is the mystery of the church's catholicity."[30]

In these terms we must see that Melanchthon in the Augsburg Confession was viewing the church from the side of God's grace in Christ which energizes it. Turn off the electricity and a light bulb goes dark, ceasing to be a light, even though glass and wire filament remain. Likewise if God's grace is lacking, there is no church, even though outward form and organization remain.

The church therefore must be seen as full of vitality and warmth

27 Vilmos Vajta, *Die Theologie des Gottesdienstes bei Luther* (Göttingen, 1954), p. 17.
28 *Ibid.*, p. 24.
29 *Loc. cit.*
30 Charles Journet, *The Primacy of Peter* (Westminster, Md., 1954) pp. 11 f.

and movement. Put it under the theological microscope and it is observed to be in motion, continually fluctuating in shape. To say that it exists where the Gospel is rightly preached and the sacraments rightly administered is to say that it is in contact with divine reality, that it is vitalized by grace, that it is alive. This was recognized by the Danish bishop, N. F. S. Grundtvig, who "pointed to the sacraments of the Lutheran Church as non-documentary but living testimonies of what constitutes authentic Christianity."[31] This is the ecclesiastical significance of the words, "He that hath the Son of Man hath life."

In this light it is a mistake to think that the Augsburg Confession's statement is redolent of Romanism, only a step removed from the position which identifies the church with the sacraments administered by a priesthood. In the Smalcald Articles (II, 2, 10) Luther asserted that "when the Mass falls the papacy lies in ruins." In Roman thinking the church is sacerdotal because it is sacramental. The church exists where the Mass is found. Church buildings are erected as sanctuaries for the sacrifice of the Mass. Liturgy is king.

The Reformation recovered the insight that the church exists where Christ is found. Church buildings are simply convenient enclosures for the assembling, the congregating of believers. This assembly, this congregation, this gathering, this meeting, this *ecclesia* is church only because Christ is present in Word and sacrament. It is the body of Christ, the embodiment of Church. The presence of Christ, unlike the presence of the relics of a saint in the *confessio* of a Roman church, is a living, vital reality. That presence is certified to our senses in hearing the spoken Word, in feeling the baptismal water, in tasting the communion elements. Liturgy is never king, but only servant. So, says Luther, "The *ecclesia,* the holy Christian people, has mere outward words, sacraments, and offices, such as God's imitator, Satan, has and has in far greater number; but it has these things commanded, instituted, and ordained by God, so that he himself, and not any angel, will work through them with the Holy Ghost."[32] Brunner puts it this way: "Through these rites there finds expression the truth that the fellowship of Jesus is grounded in an *action* of God.

31 Ernest D. Nielsen, *N. F. S. Grundtvig, An American Study* (Rock Island, 1955), p. 112.
32 "On the Councils and the Churches," *WML,* V, 292. *WA,* L, 647.

which takes place in the real historical world, and for the completion of which God uses the Christian community."[33]

This actually is the essential intent of the statement of the Augsburg Confession. Whatever else may be said, the church is a fellowship whose faith is aroused, strengthened, and expressed in worship. Gordon Rupp summarizes recent investigations by saying that Luther "insisted that in the first place the *communio sanctorum* is a fellowship of persons, and that meaning has priority before the other possible interpretation, a sharing in holy things."[34] But surely in Luther the two ideas go together. Thus in 1520 Luther wrote, "I believe that there is on earth, throughout the whole wide world, no more than one holy common Christian church, which is nothing else than the congregation or assembly of the saints, i.e., the good, believing men on earth, which is gathered, preserved, ruled by the Holy Ghost, and is daily increased by means of the sacraments and the Word of God."[35]

The Augsburg Confession's statement had to fight on two fronts. On the one side were the papists insisting that church meant organization, hierarchy, regulations, canon law. The Reformers recognized this as a perversion both in terms of the New Testament and of the ancient church. On the other side were the Anabaptists and others for whom *ecclesia* meant a select fellowship with nothing of historical ecclesiasticism about it. The medieval Catholics had ended in a cold, often unspiritual, and very formal institution. The Anabaptists became anti-ecclesiastical, anti-clerical, anti-liturgical, erratic, and fanatical, glibly assuming that in their varied groups they were reproducing authentic, inspirational New Testament fellowship.

The paradoxical nature of the church is overlooked by such severe antitheses. The Anabaptist insistence on fellowship was closer to the truth than the Roman demand for conformity in polity. Yet their anti-ecclesiastical presuppositions induced a blindness to the evidences of organization and structure in the New Testament *ecclesia*. If that *ecclesia* as a fellowship was without structure (that is to say, it was always fellowship and never church), why was it felt necessary to select Matthias to fill the place vacated by Judas? In reality it was a brotherhood which assembled weekly with suitable leadership for

33 *The Misunderstanding of the Church*, p. 68.
34 Gordon Rupp, *The Righteousness of God* (New York, 1954), p. 313.
35 "A Brief Form," *WML*, II, 373.

continuing communion with Christ in Word and sacrament. There was nothing clerical (that is, Roman) nor anti-clerical (that is, Anabaptist) about it. How it became clerical is a puzzle, as every student of church history knows. That is not our immediate concern.

The Augsburg Confession's statement failed if it was attempting to restore authentic New Testament conditions in the Christian fellowship. Indeed, the statement is to a degree misleading if the configuration of the phrase, "where the Gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments are rightly administered," puts in our eyes the formalized structure of an ecclesiastical organization. It has nothing to do with synods and budgets and constitutions and missionary strategy and printed minutes. Brunner, commenting on the statement, says with irony, "No one will suppose that one of the apostles would recognize again in this formula the *ecclesia* of which he had had living experience."[36]

Yet Brunner acknowledges that the statement "contains of course decisive insights into the essential nature of the *ecclesia*." Both Luther and Melanchthon agree that the church is a living, empirical reality in which Christ is present. The statement of the Augsburg Confession insists that this living reality is apparent in Christian worship. Word and sacraments are dynamic transactions in which the triune God performs his transforming work in us, uniting us to himself and to one another. Where that occurs, there is church. Where that occurs there will be the energy and incentive for stewardship, for evangelism, for Christian service.

It should be obvious that Article VII of the Augsburg Confession does not give us the answers to all questions in the doctrine of the church. There are still problems. Remember Luther's oft-quoted words in *Wider Hans Worst:* "The church is a high, deep, hidden thing so that no one may know or see it, but must understand and believe only in baptism, sacrament, and Word."[37]

What we must not fail to see is that the church is a living reality most significantly recognized in worship. For if the church is a worshiping community, our task as pastors is to be ministers of worship in its most spiritual and vitalizing essence. Only in this way are we obedient to the admonition to all pastors to "feed the church of God."

36 *The Misunderstanding of the Church,* p. 103.
37 *WA,* LI, 507.

The Churches and Community Relations

By M. A. F. Ritchie

WE FIND ourselves, in the second half of the twentieth century, a bewildered world community in which holy wars are threatened and in which even the denominations of the Christian faith have strong antipathy one toward another and fear the effect upon beliefs that close social contacts may make. We live in an age in which even the official position of the Christian church in some parts of the world has expressed itself in favor of racial discrimination of the rankest kind. The troubled institutions and peoples of South Africa are Exhibit A of such a condition. All over the world the so-called colored peoples are rising and demanding independence, respect, and a decent place in the local, state, and world community where they can take their place and contribute their share to the culture.

Strife-torn peoples look to America and its ideals for inspiration and support. In the speeches of many of their leaders the great documents of American freedom are quoted and the inspiring words of American leaders are studied and repeated. The idealism expressed in the ever fresh American tradition of freedom is tarnished, however, by the vain effort of these people to find in the practice of our country a full-fledged expression of the ideals we profess. Unfortunately, the processes of democracy often are not too well understood, and the fact that we live not in a perfect democracy but in a perfecting democracy is overlooked. It is a disturbing and yet a challenging fact, however, that peoples all over the world as never before are looking with intensity, with critical eyes, and with deeply felt hope to the teeming cities, the bustling small towns, and the busy farm communities of America to see whether the dream relates itself to reality.

The people who thus view us from afar, and we ourselves who examine our own behavior at close range, cannot but recognize that in our country there are many serious problems of socio-economic distinctions and disadvantagement. There still hangs over us the fear of the outsider of different ethnic or national background. Our life is still marred by religious suspicions and unfriendliness. Conditions

of race relations, though greatly improved, still mar the record of America as a place of presumed equal opportunity.

In many cities and in many states legislation has been enacted to provide penalties for discrimination. The Supreme Court of the United States has struck down the concept of segregation and has condemned discrimination as a practice. Yet in communities both north and south and east and west the darker brother encounters difficulties of the most serious kind in seeking to take advantage of the equal opportunity that should be his American heritage. The difficulties may differ sharply in degree from section to section, but there tends to be a common denominator of kind that sadly fails to carry out the religious imperative to which we profess adherence.

With the coming of modern transportation, modern communication, and sharply increased industrialization, the country has become one of tremendous mobility of population. Communities throughout the land are changing rapidly. Children who grew up in one community may well expect to spend the middle years of life in some corner of the country a thousand miles or more away. Older people are retiring to warmer climates now that air conditioning is considered within the reach of all. Industrial firms shift their personnel as easily as the army shifts its sergeants.

Suburbanitis has come either as a blessing or a curse. The fifty-mile train ride to and from work is routine for the father in many families. Such wide separation of the place in which the bread-winner earns the living and the place in which he lives tends to divide community life. The functional aspects of the great institutions of life—the church, the school, and the home—have undergone radical changes and, whether we like them or not, they must be dealt with with all the wisdom we possess.

These are only a sampling of the complexities of community relations in this country. These complexities have boomed the market of books of the "positive thinking" ilk. They have filled the waiting rooms of psychiatrists. They have made the able sociologist one of the most sought after men in America. They have developed a new academic area of study called "human relations," which seeks to integrate the skills of the social sciences in an effort toward a solution of individual and community problems of human living.

The realization of the crucial nature of such problems in an age

witnessing the greatest technical revolution of all times is a hopeful sign. We have stopped saying that we cannot do anything about human nature and human behavior, and we seriously have begun searching for answers. But we have only begun, and the vastness of the job is frightening. In technical matters we are in the atomic age; in human relations matters we are, comparatively, just on the brink of trading in the horse and buggy for the Model T Ford.

If conditions in the world community, in the national community, and in local communities are in any wise accurately reflected in the description just given, it appears that the religious imperative has somehow failed to come to full expression in the behavior patterns of people. Have the churches failed in bringing men and women to greater maturity as children of God? Are the churches of the present day making any contribution? Or do we cynically assign the churches to the sidelines in the great human drama group of misunderstanding, tension, and conflict?

As we look at the history of community intergroup relations during the last century, certain facts are obvious, especially in respect to the Protestant churches. In large measure these churches have accepted in practice if not in theory the ideas of segregation as a way of life. Indeed, many of our Protestant churches would seem to have supposed that the Christian church was the heritage of the white race only. They seem to have forgotten that in the history of the Christian church there was once a great African church. Gallagher points out that five of the greatest theologians of the years A.D. 200 to 400 were Egyptians and Africans. He further points out that the Coptic church was a strong missionary church moving out beyond the Valley of the Nile to establish the Abyssinian church, which still survives. Gallagher reflects upon the arrogance of white Christians in strong words: "The defection of the darker races from recognized Christianity thirteen centuries ago does not prove that only white men make good Christians. On the contrary, it raises the question of whether white men can be good Christians."[1]

Whether one agrees with Gallagher's strong words or not is beside the point, which is that white arrogance and assumptions of the sole ownership of the Christian tradition are not warranted. All

1 Buell G. Gallagher, *Color and Conscience: The Irrepressible Conflict* (New York, 1946).

too often the concept of white supremacy is bolstered by the assumption that the white man is a product of Christian civilization and has the responsibility to bring it to the darker brother who has had no part of the tradition. The facts of history would not seem to support such an attitude. Rather the facts of history would tend to accuse the white man of failing in his duty to bind together the peoples who formed Christianity in its early days and to build with them the church throughout the world.

In our country, in the years following the freeing of the Negro from slavery, the churches did not make for themselves an enviable record of bringing into the body of the church the people of darker hue. On the contrary, they allowed, if they did not encourage, the splitting of denominations into black and white groups. In some cases the major churches did not make any great evangelizing effort at all in the direction of colored groups. Though I do not presume to be an authority on the subject, it is my opinion that this has tended to be, until recent years, the pattern in the Lutheran Church.

Voigt R. Cromer states that in the population of 15,000,000 Negroes in this country there are only about 21,000 Lutherans. He also points out that the United Lutheran Church has no work among Negroes in the South.[2]

In other areas of community relations, churches tended to partake of the nature of the community rather than to remake the nature of the community in the likeness of Christianity. Some churches developed a clientele among the rich, others among the poor. It is interesting and in some ways shocking to note that eminent sociologists will point out that one of the strongest indicators of class position in a community is church membership.[3] It is pretty obvious that in some cases church leadership is not taking very seriously the Master's invitation to "all," with no exceptions.

Those of us who have been "parsonage brats" and have experienced intimately the church life of communities and the home life of the minister's family have perhaps been party to or have been embarrassed by the ignorance and the bigotry of people who are honestly considered good Christians. The epithet "the Christ Killer" has not only been

2 V. R. Cromer, *Christian Action in Human Relations* (New York, 1952).

3 See chapter on "Religion and Religious Behavior" in A. B. Hollingshead, *Elmtown's Youth* (New York, 1949).

thrown at Jewish neighbors by children, but it has often been buttressed by quotations from the conversations of adults in Christian homes. Stereotypes of the most negative kinds about Jewish citizens have been a part of the social development of many of us, I am sure. Even today good Christians and Protestants sometimes exhibit surprise when reminded that Jesus Christ in his earthly person was a Jew, that the disciples were Jews, and that the Christian faith was nurtured in the homeland of the Jews. Those Christian parents who forbid their children to play with Jewish children should look closely into the faces of such children and then remember that these faces are closely related to the faces of the children whom Christ took upon his knee and blessed.

It is indeed no reflection of credit upon the church that in our day recognition of the necessity for implementation of the concept of brotherhood has come in large measure from the discoveries of science, the needs of industry, the awakening of social awareness in government spurred on by the vote in the hands of minorities, and indeed the necessities of a modern life.

It is still said of the churches of America that 11 o'clock on Sunday morning is the most segregated hour in the country. Perhaps it is not so because of any intention of present worshipers, but it is a fact that has grown out of the history of the relation of churches to human groups in communities across the land. It is felt by some, as a Jewish rabbi friend of mine has pointed out, that the churches have not succeeded in evangelizing the Jewish peoples of the country because they have tried to argue Jewish people into Christianity instead of setting before them an example of Christian brotherhood.

Despite the weaknesses that none of us would wish to deny and despite the vast amount of progress that we have yet to make, it is interesting to note that religious leaders have begun to relate beliefs to behavior to an increasing degree in the present day. The pope, for example, has condemned discrimination, especially anti-Semitism. Jewish leaders have been in the forefront of seeking solutions for problems of race relations. They have also established organizations, such as the Jewish Chautauqua Society, which seek to increase the degree of mutual understanding between Christians and Jews. The National Council of Churches has made notable pronouncements on race relations. In the National Lutheran Council similar concern has been expressed.

Perhaps as great a tribute to the power of church leadership in community relationships as I have heard is that given by Dr. George Mitchell, director of the Southern Regional Council, the race relations organization supported by the Ford Foundation and working to create greater understanding throughout the South. George Mitchell said in effect that "you can go in race relations in the South about as fast as church people will go with you." I agree with that statement, and I agree with it not only in respect to the South but in respect to the country at large. It is for this reason that I suggest that churchmen must accept responsibility for the church's role as a social institution. They must recognize its potential influence and they must fashion policies that are consistent with the problems and the needs and the realities of our times.

In the study of human relations and of group behavior we are just now beginning to understand the role of feeling. We are saying that prejudice is to a considerable extent emotional in its origin. In the area of community group relations the church is a major medium of constructive understanding, for it appeals to the heart as well as to the head.

As we all know, prejudice and discrimination are not synonymous, though discrimination certainly rises from a base of prejudice. Often people who participate willingly in discriminatory practices do not do so as a direct result of their own prejudiced attitudes. Often they engage in such practices in order to conform with what is an accepted behavior pattern in the community. Such people may wish to behave differently when they are challenged with the rightness or wrongness of the discriminatory practice; yet they are not strong enough as individuals to buck the social pattern of the community. In most such communities, however, the human power structure of the community is found in the membership of the churches. The power structure of the community, if reached, can change the prevailing practices and can provide different patterns to which the average citizen conforms.

Many of our churches, Lutheran included, are in communities in which there is great population change. Often these churches formerly had about them the homes and businesses of the so-called middle class. In many cases these communities now have been populated to a large extent by people of the so-called lower class or people of a so-called outgroup, which may or may not be a lower class in an economic

sense. Such churches are often on the rack of deep concern as to whether they should strive to hold their middle class population which has tended to move to the suburbs or whether they should integrate into the life of the church, insofar as possible, the people in the community in which the church is located.

Applying the Christian ethic in its simple and profound implications, the answer is obvious. The church should serve all the people, including those who live next door to it. But putting the implications of the Christian ethic into practice is not so simple. Pride in social status is to be considered, and there are often deep-seated prejudices and perhaps years of discriminatory practice as a carry-over from a time in which such practice was not frowned upon and in which the isolation of the church leadership from the outgroup was such that no one was faced with the realities of intimate contact. In such churches the minister needs to work carefully with the lay leadership and to be most sympathetic to the heart-rending conflict in the minds and hearts of individuals as well as in the body of the church group itself. Such churches are the cutting edge of democracy, and they may well be the proof of the quality of present-day Christianity.

Sometimes social and economic status is as potent a basis for discrimination as race or ethnic differences. I shall never forget the instance in a rural community where my father had accepted a Lutheran pastorate. My mother was a very energetic woman and went out, as it were, into the highways and byways to compel new members to come in. She gathered up the children of the poor farm workers, sometimes called the "poor white trash," and brought them proudly to Sunday school. You can imagine her dismay and disillusionment when the ladies of the missionary society who so energetically sent money and clothing to the poor abroad suggested to Mother that the church was not interested in these newcomers and that they would be much better off in some other church which catered to the lower classes.

I was reminded of this instance in a discussion with Hartwick College students after one of our week-end work camps which are annually put on by the Student Christian Association. In a post-workshop evaluation session, we had a buffet dinner for the group at our house, and afterwards we tried to evaluate what had been learned in this experience of working with people who seemed to need a helping hand. I raised the question, to what extent our young people had

helped their underprivileged friends to make contact with the churches of the community. One young man expressed doubt that there would be much result in this project because the children in the homes visited did not have the kind of clothes they needed to attend church. Then I raised the question, whether the assumption that any special kind of clothes is a prerequisite to church attendance is sound as a Christian attitude. We had a long and exciting discussion. Some of the youngsters said that in their own upbringing there had been the assumption that a bath and well-starched clothes and shiny shoes were prerequisites to church attendance. Others did not take this position, but felt that in the upbringing of the underprivileged people themselves there would be enough of this same feeling to prevent them from accepting the churches' open hand of welcome. Then others suggested that, if this were the case, our Student Christian Association should help these people to get the kind of raiment and the kind of cleanliness that they needed for church attendance.

I do not pretend to suggest the right answer in such a case, but I do suggest that we might well examine the role of new clothes, expensive hairdos, fur coats, and exotic perfumes in contributing to a feeling of security in attending the church of one's choice and in approaching the altar in a house of God. I am sure that there are no easy solutions, but I suggest that an examination of the whole field of accepting people as they are and making sure that they feel welcome in God's house as they are should be among the things that ought to concern us in every church.

All over the country the question of the new role of the Negro in American life is of concern to the churches. In a good many places in our country, including New York State, the door of the church is theoretically open to the Negro. In some parts of the South, contrary to general belief, this is also true, especially in Catholic churches. It is interesting to note that in many parts of the South as well as the North, bodies comparable to our synods, conferences, women's organizations, and Luther League no longer meet on a segregated basis but meet on an integrated basis. Especially is this true of the youth conferences of many of the churches.

In both the North and the South people often wonder why more Negroes have not associated themselves with the so-called white churches. They point out that in some parts of the country there is a

real open door, both theoretical and actual, for the Negro. There are at least two reasons why the Negro has not associated himself in great numbers with formerly all-white churches. One reason is that in the course of the years Negro subdivisions have grown up within many of the great Protestant church bodies. In these separate units vested interests of many kinds have grown up. These vested interests will tend to perpetuate for many years to come the separate entity of the colored division of a particular denomination. The other reason is that in many churches which have a theoretical non-segregation point of view there is a psychological isolation which the Negro may feel, and which may operate quite as potently in preventing full fellowship as more formalized and more formidable types of rejection.

One of the challenging concerns for Lutherans today is the fact that there is no large colored subdivision in the Lutheran Church. Hence the Lutheran Church has the opportunity, if it wishes to embrace it, of simply opening its doors and inviting into its fellowship the Negro citizen. If there are any laws to prevent this, they are very rare indeed. Whether such a development on the part of the Lutheran Church is practical may be open to question. But the fact that there is such an opportunity is not debatable. If the Lutheran Church were to evangelize Negroes on a separate basis, it would almost have to start from scratch; but it would be a simple and inexpensive and theoretically practical proposition to open the doors of the existing Lutheran churches throughout the country to the Negro.

If such a proposition were argued in the Lutheran Church—and it may well have been many times over—the old question of segregation would come into the discussion. Some of those who might discuss the matter would certainly point out that many of our great church and interchurch bodies have declared segregation in and of itself to be sin. Some of them would point out that the church at large should condemn the behavior of some of our people in rejecting at least temporarily the Supreme Court decision in regard to segregation in the public schools. Others would point out that segregation often exists not so much because of specific rejection by white people in an institution but because of the housing pattern that has grown up in a segregated society. They would say that we might set new Lutheran churches down in the middle of Negro communities and that they would therefore automatically be all Negro churches.

Probably in such a discussion tempers might become very heated and the word "bigot" might well be flung across the discussion table. I suggest that the practice of calling people bigots is a very wasteful and useless practice. We need to fight bigotry at its source and to try to remove the conditions that produce bigotry. Tacking undesirable labels on other people is an aggressive act and it provokes aggression in return. We need to develop understanding rather than form negative judgments.

I am sure that many church bodies are tempted to pass resolutions condemning the failure of communities in various parts of the country to conform to the Supreme Court decision on desegregation in education. It would be my judgment that such resolutions of condemnation are most undesirable. Such resolutions tend only to create resentment and to be tantamount to calling other presumably sincere churchmen names. On the other hand, resolutions of an affirmative nature by conferences and synods would be constructive. Such resolutions do not condemn; they affirm. They hold high the ideals of those who pass the resolutions; they do not pass judgment upon others. Having passed affirmative resolutions, conferences and synods need to set about to provide, for people in other parts of the country, a sterling example of action in conformity to profession.

Some may fear that the Negro, once invited in to a church, will take it over. It seems to me that perhaps the best answer to that is a story told of a great Negro preacher and educator. It is said that he once stood before a group of white churchmen and pleaded with them to open their doors so that a man with a dark skin could feel free to come in and pray at any time and worship with his brothers of a lighter hue. His logic was deadly, his eloquence was inspiring. But as he concluded, he said to his audience in effect: "Brethren, we want the right to do this. But do not fear; if we get the right we will certainly not push you out. Most of our people will stay in the churches they now attend. Only a few of our people will invoke the right for which we fight."

In general, the Negro has been notable for his restraint and for his avoidance of any suggestions of "pushiness." In the higher collegiate institutions of the South which have recently opened their doors to Negroes, this is especially evident. Before I left the South in 1953 there were at least fifty such institutions, many of them private. In these schools there are several thousand Negroes now, but in no case

has there ever been any tendency on the part of the Negro to overrun the institution. Even though the doors of these institutions now are open, many years will pass before the proportion of Negroes will become a sizable segment of the student bodies.

In facing up to these many problems, it seems to me that the church has a strong responsibility to bring into the orbit of its study not only biblical injunctions but also basic scientific facts on prejudice, discrimination, race, ethnic culture groups, varying religious groups, and social-economic differences. It seems to me that churches should avail themselves of the rich resources in nearby colleges and universities and the expert knowledge of distinguished anthropologists and others in enriching church educational programs so that the facts of science and the methods of education can be related to the great religious imperative.

A great tragedy has been the fact that sometimes our church leaders have failed to have an understanding of community relations and have failed to seek the advice of those who are trained in this important field. Several years ago a very important study was published under the title *Elmtown's Youth* by A. B. Hollingshead. This study concerned the youth in one town and examined the impact of social classes upon adolescents of the high school age. Dr. Hollingshead is one of the most distinguished sociologists in the country and at that time was serving on the faculty of Yale University.

His chapter on religious and social behavior is a most challenging one. In it he pointed out the extent to which religious affiliation tended to divide the young people into groups and to be a sort of badge of social standing. The one section of the chapter that attracted my special attention was the social scientist's examination of the behavior of a certain Lutheran minister. Please let me emphasize the fact that this minister was very exceptional. I should like to quote from this chapter the rather lengthy description of the way in which this minister related himself to the young people of the community:

> The Lutheran minister categorically denies his adolescents dancing, cosmetics, curls, permanents, bobbed hair, motion pictures, alcoholic beverages, automobile rides—especially on Sunday—bowling, cards, pool, high school parties. In fact, almost every recreation approved in the non-Lutheran, non-holiness portion of the community comes under the ban. The only sanctioned pleasures are short educational films of religious shrines or foreign missionary work, shown in the church basement, and church-sponsored parties and games.

The minister realizes that he cannot deny all pleasures to his young people; so he encourages the members of the Luther League to organize roller-skating parties. However, he does not sanction their skating in either of the local rinks because they are run by "Godless men." One is owned by a Catholic, and to be seen in this rink, from the viewpoint of this minister, is an abomination in the sight of the Lord. The other rink is city owned and operated, and the minister cannot approve of it because the city is a secular institution. The approved rink is owned by a Norwegian Lutheran minister in another community. Although the minister urges his young people to go to this rink for "good, clean fun," he does not attend skating parties himself since he believes that his presence in a commercialized public place, where the one function is pleasure, places the stamp of the church's approval on the activity carried on in the place. He justifies his private, informal approval of roller-skating at this rink in these terms, "It's a good, clean place run by a Norwegian gentleman."

This rink has a reputation among non-Lutherans, adults, and adolescents as the toughest place in the vicinity.

This minister obviously was in need of an elementary, not a graduate course, in social psychology and sociology. From the description of his behavior it is probable that he felt he had the answer, but it is obvious that he was extremely naive in respect to the facts of life in a community. He was obviously gagging at theological gnats and swallowing sociological camels. It is this kind of description and my long memory of situations that I have observed with my own eyes and ears that have stimulated me to urge that young people expecting to enter the ministry should take at least basic courses in social psychology, anthropology, sociology, and, if at all possible, some specific study of intergroup relations. I have quoted from the Hollingshead book and I have said the things immediately preceding out of my concern for the social role of the church and out of the deep respect I have for the role of ministers, especially young ministers, for these problems which will not find solutions overnight.

Not from modesty but from a realization of the negative effects of such a practice, I have always studiously avoided quoting myself in articles and speeches. But here I am going to make an exception in order to quote from an article of mine published in *The Lutheran* under date of August 10, 1938, entitled "Salute the Young Minister."

Though our great secular leaders more and more admit that Christ's way of living is after all the ultimate salvation for the present chaotic world life, it is still not being used fully. To apply the remedy to the condition is the sphere of

the church; it cannot be done overnight; hence, the importance of the leadership of the young ministers. Young people today have no patience with the philosophy of religion as an escape from the problems of life; they look to it as a potent force in coping with these problems; or they have no faith in it. And with these young people the young minister must work. We who are young laymen can work with him, but the young minister must be our leader.

As I have noted, this was written in 1938, nearly twenty years ago. I believed what I wrote then very strongly; I still believe it. The only thing I would change about the quotation is the lamentable fact that I can no longer classify myself as a young layman.

My own generation of ministers and laymen have their heavy responsibilities which they cannot shirk. But those of us who have studied the onward march of social change know that social change does come slowly and has many stages of development. We know that the younger generation is much more ready for change in attitudes relating to group differences than are the members of the so-called older generation.

If one accepts the assumption that young ministers tend to be the key to social change in intergroup relations in more advanced stages, then one must accept for our Christian colleges a very great responsibility. These colleges must make sure that their departments of psychology are not only adequate but are superior. They must take the same care with their departments of sociology. And they must make sure that between their departments of psychology, sociology, and religion there is a close and fruitful relationship. If at all possible, they should find the funds to develop integrated approaches to the study of human relations, especially community relations, and still more particularly the intergroup aspects of community relations. The great scientists, both social and physical, who have examined the nature of social change in the United States and who have tried to relate it to the great imperative of our religious tradition have tended to agree that these great areas of study need to work together in a team attack upon the problems of humankind.

Some of my friends reading this article might ask of me, "Why should the church be so concerned with these matters if, as you say, the government, industry, and scientists on foundation grants are already beginning to move in the direction of solutions? Would it not be simpler to let the laws of the land eliminate discrimination? Would it not be simpler to let the other avenues of attack roll back the fron-

tiers and reveal the solutions which the church may profit from when found?"

Perhaps it is a fair question if one is not too much concerned about the Christian imperative. But even so, we need to remember that in the matter of community relations, especially intergroup relations, there is always the permissive aspect. Laws may be able to control overt behavior in which a right to work, a right to access to public facilities, or some other basic right is denied, but there remains the whole area of permissive acceptance of the outgroup person or collection of persons. The "silent treatment" in a schoolroom or the blackball in a fraternity or the frigid atmosphere of a church can hurt and can often isolate even though it cannot disbar the person from a lonely and unsatisfactory experience.

The final acceptance of other people in the Christian spirit is a thing that must arise from the inner man; it may be facilitated by legal enforcement of a new habit pattern which may eliminate the effects of oft repeated discriminatory acts, but it cannot insure the purity of unprejudiced attitudes. Such purity, which is the ideal toward which all of us strive, can be achieved, in my humble opinion, only through what might be called the spiritual influences of life—those influences which move us to accept human beings as infinitely precious and infinitely filled with potential for good. It would appear that Albert Schweitzer, if one is to judge from his writings and the record of his works, has approached this ideal. Most of us never will, but it seems to me that if we are to travel far along the way, the institution that should help us most is the institution that claims for itself a major role in the spiritual affairs of humanity. The church presumes to lead through Christian love. Its social role in the community, especially in those communities that are beset by changes of population and by threats of racial tension and of intergroup misunderstanding of many kinds, is perhaps the most difficult challenge of the church's ability to do what it presumes to do.

It seems to me, as a student of community relations and of community institutions, that churches have before them the possibility of a great renaissance of influence in the everyday life of men and women. I do not presume to say what positions churches should take in controversial matters. But I do feel strongly that churchmen must

consider, with all the wisdom they can muster from proper sources, these great problems. And it is because Protestant churches have begun to wrestle with the problems of community relations and have begun as never before to exert their influence to relate the Christian imperative to the facts of community relations that I am especially glad to be a Protestant churchman today.

Reflections on Divorce and Remarriage

By G. H. Hoffman

ONE of the most perplexing problems facing the church today centers upon the position it must maintain regarding divorce and the remarriage of divorced persons. Folkways and mores which once guided the actions of our forefathers are changing rapidly and no longer give the needed stability to our social scene. The church does not occupy the center of the community. Its influence at times is only faintly felt. People who grow to maturity in the shadow of the church remain virtually pagan. It is therefore not strange that the prestige of the family, as a cohesive force, is deteriorating in our society, with a consequent weakening of the institution of marriage. Family problems, divorce, and remarriage are but symptoms of a deep spiritual illness. A noted authority feels that "Without being guilty of exaggeration, we may well maintain that the crisis in marriage presents the Christian ethic with the most serious and the most difficult problem with which a Christian ethic has to deal. In comparison with this problem even the question of economic and political justice are of secondary importance. . . . To entrench ourselves behind any kind of tradition, even though it be most venerable, is an escape from responsibility."[1] The church must speak forth clearly and confidently to society as a witness to God's Law in order to translate the divine Law into practical living.

Statistics on divorce are almost unbelievable! For example, during the month of June, 1953, in San Diego County, California, 435 divorces were granted and 410 marriage licenses issued. A later figure from Sacramento County reveals that in January, 1954, 170 divorces were granted and 109 marriages performed.[2] Perhaps the figures are higher in California than elsewhere in the nation, but the crisis is acute wherever it is analyzed.

Our present purpose makes it necessary to deal only briefly with the causes, and we can state these in generalities. Certainly one of the basic contributing factors to family disorganization has been an over-

1 Emil Brunner, *The Divine Imperative*, p. 341.

2 Figures supplied by Emerson James, county clerk of San Diego County, Calif.

emphasis upon "individualism." Responsibility to community is seldom considered in a social climate in which the individual regards all values as relative to immediate individual needs or desires. The institution of marriage has been drastically affected by this loss of corporate responsibility. Hence we must not concern ourselves merely with the question of divorce, but with marriage itself. It is at this point that our age has lost its equilibrium.

> In the strict sense of the word, the crisis in marriage is a wholly new phenomenon, which only in recent decades has openly challenged the moral demand of monogamous marriage to the very widest extent. The causes of this crisis are many and varied, internal and external; the destruction of the economic unity of the family by industrial life and the increase of the means of communication, the housing problems of our great cities, the economic, social, and legal as well as the political and intellectual emancipation of women, the numerical surplus of women, and, above all, the profound spiritual changes which can only be suggested by recalling the use of slogans emphasizing the claims of the individual, such as the "rights of personality."[3]

Marriage

In the light of all past efforts in biblical studies, one might assume that a clear understanding would have been formulated by the church concerning such basic factors as marriage, divorce, and remarriage. However, Piper states that the church does not have such a clear-cut consensus. "Even the Roman Catholic Church is not clear in principle. Within the Anglican Communion there are continual but ineffective discussions on divorce and contraception, and the English bishops, for instance, although rejecting the right of Parliament to put forward new marriage laws, admit the necessity of a thorough-going change in divorce legislation."[4] One can find parallel examples in the American scene, for the practice of churches and clergymen with refence to the disposition of divorce and remarriage problems is most inconsistent.

The Christian view of marriage is that it is an institution of divine origin and a part of God's creative order (Gen. 2:18-24). "Therefore shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they shall be one flesh." This cleaving and this one-

3 Brunner, *op. cit.*, p. 340.

4 Otto Piper, *The Christian Interpretation of Sex* (New York, 1941), p. 6.

ness are the essence of marriage. Husband and wife become one in marriage, one in physical union and one in parenthood. Christ clearly indicates this in his discourses on marriage. "And they twain shall be one flesh, so then they are no more twain, but one flesh" (Mark 10:8). The Christian teaching on marriage stresses that it is to be much more than a physical union. Its depth is only to be perceived in its spiritual union. The unique "oneness" of a husband and a wife, marked by unyielding fidelity, is compared in the Scriptures to the unity of Christ and his church. "Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the church and gave himself for it. Wives, be subject to your husbands as to the Lord. Even so husbands should love their wives as their own bodies. He who loves his wife loves himself" (Eph. 5:22 ff.). St. Paul's analogy between marriage and communion with Christ arose from the very structure of these two forms of relationship; the man and wife become one despite all their differences in nature, by their reciprocal accommodation to each other and assumption of obligations and respective rights (II Cor. 11:2; John 3:29).[5]

That marriage is intended to be a life-long union is unquestioned. "What God has joined together let not man put asunder" is the admonition of Christ (Matt. 19:6). These words mean that marriage is a union established by God and not by the whims of man. From the hand of the Creator do I first receive my partner in marriage as "mine" and through this become "his" or "hers," which makes marriage a sacred order of creation.[6] In the sight of God marriage is indissoluble. There is no hint of marriage as a temporary relationship between husband and wife. It is not a mere contract into which two people enter and which they may break at the will of either or by common consent. Indeed, indissolubility is inherent in the idea of marriage, based upon that irrevocable nature of the structure of existence which is the basis of marriage in general and is implied in the marriage vows when they are taken seriously.[7]

The true nature of marriage really becomes clear only through God's revelation in Christ. Jesus accepted the Old Testament revelation of its meaning and purpose. He sought only to bring it into further harmony with the divine ideal. From the analogy between mar-

5 *Ibid.*, p. 15.
6 Brunner, *op. cit.*, p. 349.
7 *Ibid.*, p. 359.

riage and Christ's relation to the church three principles follow.[8] First, that it is an indissoluble covenant enduring throughout life. Second, that it is an exclusive fellowship between two persons. And third, the couple enter into an obligation to each other in respect to all they are and possess. These principles presuppose the existence of marriage as a social arrangement and hence, in some degree, also presuppose marriage laws.

Though law and custom can never create a marriage, it is nevertheless necessary, so far as it lies within its power, for the state and society to protect marriage by law and custom.[9] Unfortunately, our laws and our customs have too often been formulated on the basis of expediency and therefore have not given the support to marriage that it has needed. Nevertheless, law and custom by themselves, devoid of spiritual foundations, can be of little help. The problem is basically spiritual rather than legal.

Couples sometimes make a living torment of their marriage, and on this account many people today dispute that marriage ought to be a lifelong bond. They insist that its duration should depend only on the endurance of love and affection between the two persons involved, or else they make it depend upon the degree of sexual compatibility. Here we encounter "individualism" at its worst. If the first marriage ends in disappointment, it is felt that one may find the blessing of marriage with another person. Impressive as this may seem, such reasoning is fallacious. "The view is that the relative value of marriage depends altogether on natural factors, and thus any error in married life can be remedied by a more suitable combination of these factors in a second marriage. But this view overlooks the fact that there are conflicting tendencies inherent in these natural factors, and thus the meaning of any marriage based upon merely natural factors is inevitably jeopardized. It is for this reason that to make life worth living Christian faith is needed in every instance; a special effort of the heart is required if we are to lay hold of the good things God gave to us to make life purposeful."[10]

Obviously, the most constructive approach to the problem of marriage and divorce is a preventive one. We must recognize our failures

8 Piper, *op. cit.*, p. 158.
9 Brunner, *op. cit.*, p. 358.
10 Piper, *op. cit.*, p. 161.

and be willing to correct them. Modern marriages are predicated on a false premise—namely, that they are to be based upon the love of one person for another. As Emil Brunner points out, that this is to build on insecure foundations. "Where marriage is based on love all is lost from the very outset. The lover cannot guarantee that his emotion of love will be either permanent or directed solely to the one person. Such a marriage, because it is only possible as a hypothesis, is broken the moment it is concluded, or rather, it never existed. To base marriage on love is to build on sand. It is this subjective individualism, more than anything else, which has caused the present crisis in marriage."[11]

It is true, of course, that marriage springs from love, but its stability is based not on love but on fidelity. The latter is the only quality which can guarantee the permanence of the marriage relation, for marriage which is based only upon love is inevitably accompanied by the fear that love may fade, and with it the dissolution of the marriage. Piper supports this view of Brunner when he states that faithfulness is the real core of marriage unity and stability. "Because the two persons have become a unity as a consequence of their marital relations, they are under the necessity of remaining faithful to one another if they are not to act against the meaning of their own life."[12] Jesus therefore taught that even a lustful glance was a betrayal of faithfulness. Love is dependent upon fidelity, for love may be reawakened and nourished by faithfulness in which the personal sense of being bound to another will cause natural love to become stable.

A second factor which will give stability to marriage is a sense of responsibility. This is of course closely related to fidelity. Brunner feels that only where there is recognition of the order of creation, of responsibility to God, where husband and wife bind themselves together in love and know themselves bound, is marriage truly concluded. Here he is not quite as arbitrary as Piper, who feels that all marriages are made in heaven. Brunner feels that marriage exists only where the divine order of marriage is recognized as binding in itself, when two people know that they are bound.[13] Here there is a sense of responsibility to someone other than the two persons involved

11 Brunner, *op. cit.*, p. 344.
12 Piper, *op. cit.*, p. 135.
13 Brunner, *op. cit.*, p. 357.

in the marriage. When both recognize this sense of responsibility to be present in the other, they experience stability and assurance of the other's love.

Divorce

Because man is a sinner it is inevitable that marriage will be abused, with divorce becoming a common problem. It is the contention of this paper that we have in practice poorly interpreted the Scriptures with respect to their pronouncements on the subject of divorce. We have arbitrarily applied certain passages of the Scriptures while seemingly excluding others from consideration. This has often caused the church to foster a legalistic view of marriage, divorce, and remarriage, resulting in confusion and inconsistency.

In the Old Testament we find a number of passages that must be considered. In the case of Deut. 22:13-21 and 28-29, we note that divorce is presupposed as an established legal institution in Israel. The passages in question stipulate that in two particular cases the husband had no right to divorce his wife: when the woman has been falsely accused of not possessing her virginity upon entry into marriage and when the husband has taken her virginity from her prior to marriage. "There is no express legislation in the Old Testament laying down rules for divorce in general."[14] In the case of Deut. 24:1-4, which is often quoted, we must note that this passage actually deals with the consequences of divorce and remarriage in a specific case. Again divorce is presupposed. This passage simply stipulates that the husband must give definite cause for divorce and actually specify where his wife has caused him offense. The mere fact that the husband no longer cared for his wife was not considered sufficient grounds for divorce (Mal. 2:10-15).

In actual cases of adultery the instruction in the Old Testament is most definite. The Law stated clearly that both were to be stoned, provided they were apprehended in the act (Deut. 22:22). Justice was to be swift and final. In such cases there was obviously no need for a divorce from an unfaithful wife.

In the matter of remarriage, not too much information is to be gleaned from the Old Testament. One does find the admonition (Deut.

14 Otto Piper, "Divorce and Protestant Theology," in *Pulpit Digest*, July, 1952, p. 12.

24:1-4) that the divorced woman who has remarried shall not return to her first husband following the death of her second husband, for she shall be regarded as "unclean." Here it must be stated that her being "unclean" was not due to her having had sexual relations with another man, for a widow was permitted to remarry. Lev. 18:18 definitely sanctions remarriage for the man, while Deut. 25:10 makes provision for the remarriage of a widow to perpetuate her husband's seed.

During the period of the prophets a legalistic ethic, resting on ceremonies, ritual, and community mores, was replaced by an ethic of moral virtue and love for the needs of the other. Following the teaching of Hosea (God's marriage to his people), the relations between a man and his wife were lifted to a higher plane in which it was realized that only faithfulness and love could preserve a marriage and prevent a divorce. However, following the post-exilic period, the Law rather than God himself became the center of religious life.[15] Holiness or perfection was interpreted as conformity with the commandments of the Mosaic Law. Hence Jesus was confronted with a legalistic interpretation of the Old Testament pronouncements on divorce and remarriage. It was forgotten that these expressed the divine will as tempered by God's long-suffering and patience in response to the stubbornness of the Israelites.

In conformity with Jesus' principle that he came not to destroy but to fulfill the Law, he accepted as valid the legislation of the Old Testament regarding marriage and divorce. However, Jesus not only restored the old traditions but also carried them forward and established a new conscience on divorce. Jesus did not censure Moses; he recognized that provisions for divorce were necessary because of the moral perverseness of men (Matt. 19:8).[16] Yet it must be observed here that Jesus took the whole matter out of a legal category and placed it in the realm of conscience. He made it evident that, however legal a divorce might be, in every instance it was a breaking of the will of God.[17] Jesus was quite emphatic in his teaching that marriage, according to the will of God, was to be binding for life (Matt. 19:5-6; Mark 10:8-9). If dissolved it is by some sinful act of man. God might sanction a divorce as a concession to human sinfulness, but only be-

15 *Ibid.*, p. 12.
16 A. D. Mattson, *Christian Ethics* (Rock Island, 1949), p. 292.
17 Emil E. Fischer, *Social Problems: The Christian Solution* (Philadelphia, 1927), p. 57.

cause of the hardness of men's hearts (Mark 10:2-12). Matthew twice inserts the qualifying words "except for unchastity" (Matt. 5:32; 19:9). At the root of every divorce or broken marriage lies sin. "Every one who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery, and he who marries a woman divorced from her husband commits adultery" (Luke 16:18). To suggest that Jesus taught that divorce is justifiable because of adultery is to misrepresent the spirit of the passage. Permission of divorce for this or any other reason is not a genuine part of Jesus' teaching, although it must be admitted that only with his permission does the saying conceivably become a part of the customs and legal structure of any possible human society.[18] From the Christian point of view a true marriage can neither be created nor annulled by law or social custom. Jesus showed, rather, how the true law was to be conceived—a law based on divine foundations according to which not only adultery and prostitution but even a lustful glance and lascivious touch are sinful, and according to which there are no circumstances in which divorce is justifiable.[19]

Thus, brushing aside the rabbinical question concerning permissible grounds, Christ uttered a categorical rejection of divorce. He charged the scribes with dragging the question down to the level of man's inexcusable weakness while they should be guided in their interpretation by the vision of the goal for which man is destined. From this it ought to be apparent that no one who divorces a wife or husband can claim that he acts according to the will of God. Rather he must admit that he is unwilling to live up to God's expectation of him.

The approach of Christ to the question of divorce and remarriage, though based on Old Testament teachings, was nonetheless a revolution in Jewish life. He stated the principle that what is lawful is not necessarily good since the standard of goodness must be the perfection for which God has made us.[20] Interestingly, many scholars maintain that, since Matthew alone mentions the exception (adultery) and all other New Testament passages speak of Christian marriage as absolutely indissoluble, the words "except for fornication" in 5:32 and 19:9 are interpolations introduced by Jewish Christians to modify the

18 Paul Ramsey, *Basic Christian Ethics* (New York, 1952), p. 71.
19 Piper, in *Pulpit Digest*, p. 13.
20 *Ibid.*, p. 13.

excessive strictness of the original utterance. Thus it is maintained that Christ forbade divorce altogether.[21]

No matter how "innocent" one party may appear in a divorce, the church must point out that being a party to a divorce is to participate in that which is essentially sinful and contrary to the will of God. The church must again place emphasis upon the guilt of divorce and the sharing in it by all concerned rather than upon the legality of divorce or the distinction between a so-called "guilty" and "innocent" party. Where Christ apparently sanctions divorce, it is only as an illustration of the way in which the divine intention was being transgressed. Adultery, for example, severs the spiritual tie and dissolves the union, accomplishing what the divorce law can only declare to be a legal fact.[22]

The teaching of St. Paul appears to support what has been stated, for when he discusses the problem of divorce in I Cor. 7:10-15, he makes a clear distinction between Christian and mixed marriages. The apostolic church appears to have permitted divorce in cases where one of the spouses was an unbeliever. In such a marriage, the unbelieving partner in the marriage may no longer be willing to live with the Christian spouse. If this be so, Paul insists that no pressure be brought to bear upon the unbeliever if he or she wishes "to depart" (I Cor. 7:15). Here St. Paul was only being practical, for it would be difficult to convince a non-Christian that divorce is sin, committed against the will of God. It is quite characteristic of the spirit of Paul, however, that in such cases the liberty to marry again was not given to the Christian spouse. In I Tim. 5:11-14 Paul advises young widows to remarry, indicating that the early church did not regard remarriage as sinful in itself. However, Paul definitely forbids remarriage to the person who willingly separated from his or her spouse (I Cor. 7:11). The danger here is that these passages may be interpreted legally rather than as a practical solution to a problem that clearly existed in Paul's time. Nevertheless, on the basis of the passages quoted many churches, including the Lutheran Church, have recognized two reasons as legitimate grounds for divorce: adultery and desertion. It is to be questioned whether we have not made too little of Paul's distinction between believer and unbeliever. That marriage today can be dissolved

21 Mattson, *op. cit.*, p. 291.
22 Fischer, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

by the state indicates how little the present legal form of marriage corresponds with God's intent.

The Scriptures are most emphatic in asserting that in every area of life man is "altogether sinful" and in need of God's forgiving love. Most assuredly this must also apply to marriage and divorce. With this in mind the Christian ethic, supported by the Sermon on the Mount, has always admitted certain "reasons" for divorce, though, as stated earlier, as a concession to human sinfulness. Yet here is the ethically dangerous point. As the church developed historically and the state assumed many of the church's functions, attempts were made to bring New Testament teachings into harmony with secular law. Man took the concessions to human sinfulness and appropriated them to himself as almost an inalienable right, giving the scriptural passages on the reasons for divorce a legalistic connotation. The theory about reasons for divorce "belongs to the saddest chapters in Christian ethics, for nowhere is the mingling of law and ethics so crude as it is here, giving credence to an absolutely immoral materialism of thought, both in that which is recognized as a reason for divorce as well as in that which is not recognized as such."[23] None of the reasons given by the church constitute in themselves an ethical reason for divorce. No matter what can be said in favor of a divorce from the legal viewpoint, with but few exceptions it indicates a failure of faith. The weakness of legalism is that it fails to point this out and stresses the claim of what is due.

Those who advocate a legal attitude to divorce must admit that the problem has become hopelessly complicated by the divorce legislation of most states and the legal "reasons" given in most cases of divorce. This has made it almost impossible to tell what the real cause of divorce was and who the innocent person is. As Barry points out, "the legal tie [of marriage] corresponds no longer to any moral or spiritual realities."[24] Piper also feels strongly on this point and adds: "It is obvious that in such a situation not only the casuistic approach to divorce and remarriage that has been attempted in modern Protestantism, but also the legalistic solution, have to give way to that deepened understanding of marriage revealed by Jesus and practiced by

23 Brunner, *op. cit.*, p. 362.
24 F. R. Barry, *Christianity and the New World*, p. 235.

the primitive church."[25] Jesus, knowing human nature, recognized that every marriage would not succeed. He did not condemn or drive away a divorced person. Neither did he excuse divorce. He spoke no word by which a man or woman might whitewash his or her divorce and convert it into a righteous act.

However, Ramsey reminds us that no legislator since Moses has failed to allow divorce for the hardness of men's hearts, whether the legislator was drawing up laws for some secular state or was ruling some church community through canon law.[26] However, it should be noted that, whether the legislation was lenient or rigorous, the purpose was always that sin be more restrained than released from restraint. It is not difficult, therefore, to understand why the church, being concerned with the same problem, so easily adopted a legalistic interpretation. Most biblical scholars seem to agree with Emil Brunner that "the moral presuppositions of divorce, in contradistinction to the legal presuppositions, can be codified in no law."[27]

Untenable as the legalistic position appears to be, it nevertheless has been very much in evidence. The result is that adultery is considered a natural and just cause for divorce. This, in turn, has encouraged the notion that we shall be able to solve our conjugal difficulties by means of divorce, ignoring entirely that there may be other ways of solving the problem.[28] "Were it not for the fact that pastoral practice has at all times acted with far more insight than the official doctrine would have permitted, the disaster would have attained greater proportions and the crisis would have developed much earlier. It is the curse of 'Christian morality' that it always regards the most legalistic view as the 'most serious.' "[29] Brunner feels that the present crisis in marriage is not only the product of godless living but also a product of ideas which sprang out of the primitive church and have grown up within and without the church.[30] He is quite convinced that it is useless not only to appeal to tradition but also to use isolated Bible passages in attempting to defend the position of legalism. "We may even maintain that the theological ethic of marriage is the point at which Protes-

25 Piper, in *Pulpit Digest,* p. 15.
26 Ramsey, *op. cit.,* p. 238.
27 Brunner, *op. cit.,* p. 362.
28 Piper, *The Christian Interpretation of Sex,* p. 204.
29 Brunner, *op. cit.,* p. 31.
30 *Ibid.,* p. 382.

tant ethics has remained either Anabaptist or Catholic, since it here applied the Sermon on the Mount as "law."[31]

It must be repeatedly emphasized that the New Testament is not a law code. It is strange that we should use it as a legal code in dealing with the divorce question. A. D. Mattson asserts that such a procedure has never been very satisfactory and that this is demonstrated by the fact that the churches which have tried it never seem to be done with arguing about the divorce problem and their attitude to it.[32] He even suggests that adultery is often committed within such a context simply for the sake of getting a "legitimate" ground for divorce. Thus, ironically, the legalistic view conceivably encourages sin rather than achieve its avowed purpose of restraining it.

Wayne Oates makes the dilemma of the pastor quite clear when he states that the obvious interpretations given by legalists leave the pastor with no recourse in counseling divorced people but to excommunicate them from personal fellowship as well as from that of the church of which they are members. He then quotes a letter written to him by a woman. "It seems to me that all sins except one are forgiven and blotted out and we are given another chance. Is this for me now too? And if so, then what do the verses about marriage and divorce mean that bother me so?"[33]

Obviously, the church must seek for some other answer to this perplexing dilemma created by the climate of legalism. Penal discipline has always defeated its purpose. History and counseling experiences teach us that the penal use of the Scriptures has failed miserably.[34]

It is the unending task of the church to set before men everywhere the highest standard of conduct as well as the purest forms of creed and worship. Yet the church must be slow to enforce them by confining her membership only to those who acquiesce. "The shepherd's staff and not the tyrant's sword must be her true weapon. The whole flock is to be led into the fold, not the few harried into it whilst the many are left to their fate."[35] It is also the unique task of the church to offer forgiveness of sins through the Gospel of Christ, to teach that all are sinners and in need of repentance and forgiveness.

31 *Ibid.*, p. 341.
32 Mattson, *op. cit.*, p. 292.
33 Wayne Oates, *The Bible in Pastoral Care* (Philadelphia, 1952), p. 40.
34 *Ibid.*, p. 29.
35 Kenneth E. Kirk, *The Vision of God* (New York, 1928), p. 469.

Mindful of God's gracious offer of forgiveness through Christ, the church must also teach love to neighbor. The church must admonish its people that the highest ethic is the path of forgiving love. That is to say, there are better solutions than divorce in marriage problems. Many marriages which end in divorce might have been preserved if the one who was in error had taken opportunity to ask the other's forgiveness, or if forgiveness had been freely offered without claims. There must be the desire to forgive for the sake of reclaiming love. "For Jesus," writes Ramsey, "the order of claims upon another has been supplanted by a sequence dictated by another's needs. Unclaiming love will hardly find any cause for divorce, least of all will it fasten first upon what is the chief reason for divorce in the attitude of a person mainly concerned to claim his or her own right."[36] The church must seek to instill in the hearts of people a willingness to forgive times without number, based on a desire to abandon all claims upon others, however just or "legal" they may appear in the sight of secular law. Measured by God's will, no marriage is without sin. Before God the crucial question remains whether anyone has ever maintained the true sanctity of marriage. It would appear that Jesus pointed this out most clearly in the story of the woman taken in adultery (John 8:2-11).

At a time when it was legally permissible, and even customary to dissolve a marriage because of adultery, Hosea portrayed God's love as stronger than legal considerations. We must remind ourselves again that the reality of marriage never corresponds to the ideal. Just as there are only sinful human beings, so there are only sinful marriages, as Paul points out: "There is none that doeth good, no not one" (Rom. 3:12). "Who would presume to judge whether a man, who in the eyes of the civil law is blameless as a married man, is really less blameworthy on this account before God than another man who in the eye of the law is living in an irregular union? We are all 'below the line,' for we are all adulterers, some within legitimate marriage and others outside of it."[37]

Brunner again draws the issue into sharp focus when he states that through the sinfulness of all that is called marriage, the ways of an evangelical ethic and all legalistic systems must ever diverge; for it is at this point that the Protestant ethic is summoned to make a

36 Ramsey, *op. cit.*, p. 72.
37 Brunner, *op. cit.*, p. 353.

clean sweep of the leaven of legalism which is still at work within it as its inheritance from Catholicism.[38] He feels that, since the church has fallen back upon this seemingly more secure position of legalism, it must bear a burden of the guilt. It is only with such an approach that we can begin to formulate a positive evangelical ethic for divorce and remarriage.

We certainly cannot ignore the reality of divorce as another symptom of human sinfulness. We are indeed "an adulterous generation" and in need of divine forgiveness. The Protestant ethic has gradually come to see the possibility that under some circumstances divorce may be a moral duty, but it has admitted this reluctantly as a concession.[39] In matters of marriage it appears that God is more merciful than the moralist. Brunner feels that if we could learn fully to discover this mercy of God we would have a more certain defense against moral laxity than could be provided by any legalistic code which so proudly plumes itself upon its "seriousness" and its "freedom from compromise."[40]

It is true that the church must safeguard itself against any tendency to lower its standards concerning the sanctity of marriage. An abuse in this direction inevitably tends to strengthen the legalistic position. The church must "lose itself" in the Gospel of Christ and learn from him how he could forgive all sinners, draw them unto himself, and yet not lower standards. The dilemma remains, as Kirk points out, that the church's best efforts in the past to put this higher ethic into effect in the face of complex demands from the world has been blundering and blind compared with him.[41] The church's purpose in the world is to help men to know God, and on that depends the whole scheme of Christian ethics. Every decision of the church must hinge on whether this or that course will bring the sinner into a closer relationship to Christ, and whether the reclaiming love of Christ is enhanced or restricted by its ethic. Only if it pursues its course with this as its plumbline will it carry out its mission.

It would seem to follow, then, as Piper also insists, that the church cannot do otherwise than permit divorce in certain circumstances; yet

38 *Ibid.*, p. 351.
39 *Ibid.*, p. 354.
40 *Ibid.*, p. 354.
41 Kirk, *op. cit.*, p. 469.

not as an act which is right in itself, but as the lesser of evils.[42] Brunner even suggests that it is conceivable that a case might arise in which, in order to obey the divine command, one might have to act "against the law," making the dissolution of marriage a duty.[43] Often a divorce is only a legal recognition of something that has already transpired in God's sight. Nevertheless, as many have pointed out, the church of Christ may neither excuse nor condone divorce by affirming that because two people have proposed divorce the marriage is already dissolved. Piper asks: "Are God's purposes served by keeping together outwardly that which inwardly has been severed? A situation may arrive in which even Christians may find that divorce alone offers a means of escape from the failure of their marriage, for living together would be even worse than separation since it would only tend to make a caricature of the biblical concept of marriage."[44]

The church must free itself of past restraints and stress the higher ethical ideal of marriage, and, pointing to sin as the real cause of divorce, deal with it as with other sin in an evangelical spirit of reclaiming love. We rather like the statement of A. D. Mattson who writes: "divorce can never be condoned, but we shall have to take human nature for what it is."[45] Moreover, it must be pointed out that living by the grace of forgiveness does not mean that God will accordingly remove all the evil consequences of the sin of divorce. In this sense, man must continue to carry his burdens, whatever they may be. Sin always requires its price. Man must live out his life in the "Kingdom on the left."

The church must quicken the conscience of its people to see divorce for what it really is: a failure. But it must also point out that Christian love in marriage "bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things" (I Cor. 13:7-8). Fischer adds new insight when he states that, though differences of opinion regarding legal divorce may be unavoidable, this is not to be regretted so much as the moral laxity which is indifferent to the unmistakable spirit of the New Testament teachings.[46] Only eternity will reveal the irreparable harm done by an arbitrary view toward the matter of divorce and will reveal

42 Piper, *op. cit.*, p. 205.
43 Brunner, *op. cit.*, p. 354.
44 Piper, *op. cit.*, p. 205.
45 Mattson, *op. cit.*, p. 293.
46 Fischer, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

the many souls who were not reclaimed because the church "stood afar off," washing its hands of all immoral association with the "guilty" as it sought to console only the "innocent."

Remarriage

Much of what has been said in the foregoing discussion already suggests what the position of the church must be relevant to remarriage. Recalling again the purpose of the church as that of reclaiming the sinner, "to deny a divorced person remarriage may subject him to greater temptations and sins than he, in his state of limited spiritual maturity, can resist."[47] However, forgiveness for the sin of divorce, and those sins which preceded it, should not be interpreted as giving cause for any leniency or callous indifference to remarriages. It must be borne in mind that the Scriptures teach the ideal that a divorced person should not remarry during the lifetime of the former spouse. Nevertheless, once the ethical possibility of divorce, within the limits already indicated, has been admitted, the question of the remarriage of divorced persons becomes most vital.

Granted that all second marriages contradict the true spirit of marriage as something that can only take place once, nevertheless human sinfulness makes this relative. Emil Brunner suggests that "in spite of our fundamental scruples, actually in most cases remarriage is the more decent solution, and the one which corresponds more closely to the ideal, than to remain unmarried"—not merely for the widowed, but also for the divorced.[48] Undergirding this judgment is the advice of St. Paul that for most people "it is better to marry than not to marry." Economic factors, the support of children from the first marriage, and the basic needs of the divorced person must enter into the judgment of pastoral counsel. The remarriage of a divorced person, even under the ministrations of the church, may therefore be permissible after full consideration of all the individual circumstances involved.[49] To deny remarriage to a divorced person may subject him or her to a greater life of evil. Again the principle of reclaiming love must govern the judgment of pastoral counsel.

47 "Marriage, Divorce, and Remarriage," statement of the Board of Christian Social Action, American Lutheran Church, Feb. 8, 1955, p. 8.

48 Brunner, *op. cit.*, p. 363.

49 "Marriage, Divorce, and Remarriage," A. L. C. statement, p. 8.

It is possible, therefore, that circumstances and arguments which will justify Christians in departing from the ideal stressed by Christ with reference to divorce may also warrant remarriage for other causes. Different degrees of seriousness in the infraction of claims are of great importance, but they give no ground for begging the question of Christian ethics in favor of divorce under one circumstance only, since divorce for any reason is absolutely different from no divorce at all.[50] We are not to assume that in every case of remarriage the second will terminate as unfortunately as the first. The possibility of spiritual growth must be seriously weighed. The basic premise of the Christian faith makes a new beginning possible in spite of the fact that the old life has been shattered. The Lord of the church still speaks, "Lo, I make all things new." Piper suggests that the public vow of faithfulness made to a new party at a remarriage has the significance of an act of repentance.[51]

We must be aware that here again we are dealing with the basic purpose of the church in the world. We are confronted with the task of defining our ultimate aim in dealing with people. We can conceive of our task as that of aiding the weak and sinful to be pure in heart, or we can limit our area of activity by drawing up a moral code, legally stated with precise boundaries, which will eliminate the weak and erring and include only the strong and righteousness. Obviously, the latter is not the spirit of Christ, nor should it be that of the church, which has the Gospel entrusted to it.

The whole approach of a pastor to the divorced who plan to remarry should be to look in the direction of the creative possibilities that such a remarriage may have for the future realization of a more wholesome and abundant life. The pastor must conceive of his office as that of a shepherd whose mission it is to counsel with the wounded ones. "God has qualified us to be ministers of a new covenant, not in a written code, but in the Spirit; for the written code kills, but the Spirit gives life" (II Cor. 3:5-6). Wayne Oates is most helpful when he suggests that the pastor bears the necessary tensions between being a preacher of the ideals of Christ on the one hand, and manifesting the pastoral tenderness of Jesus toward persons who have failed to measure

50 Ramsey, *op. cit.*, p. 72.
51 Piper, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

up to those ideals on the other hand.[52] Such an approach opens up new pathways to a more creative solution to this perplexing problem.

The spiritual counselor must look for the causes of divorce rather than the symptoms. We must surrender the quest for the "innocent" party so that we might give a clean bill of health to him. Seeking after the causes of a marriage's failure, the pastor will discover that everyone has sinned in the conspiracy of blind impulse and base ignorance of God's sacred orders—sins in which even the church dare not cast the first stone, for it, too, shares in the guilt. The counseling situation must then be based upon restorative therapy rather than a punitive or judicial one.

The spirit of reclaiming love dictates, however, that caution be used before concurring in a remarriage. Recent studies reveal that the possibility of divorce rises with each successive marriage, indicating that remarriages are less stable than first marriages. Therefore, no opportunity should be lost to bring about an awareness of the ideal of marriage, the gravity of the sin when that ideal is so carelessly ignored, and the need for repentance in order to gain pardon and forgiveness. The pastor should refuse to perform a marriage ceremony when the ideal is not accepted.[53] Every facility must be used that is available to create basic Christian attitudes toward marriage and the Christian way of life. Personal responsibility for marriage failure should be frankly acknowledged and a spirit of rededication to the ideals of Christ strongly affirmed. Before a marriage is consummated a definite program of instruction in marriage and family living should be accepted. A couple's intention of affiliating with a church before the marriage must weigh heavily upon the pastoral decision to participate in the remarriage. The church must make itself a willing worker, a concerned partner of the new marriage, before it should admit the couple to the nuptial altar. To do anything less would be failing the couple, and the church would be remiss in its responsibility to Christ.

There are no easy answers to the pastoral problem of divorce and remarriage. The only remedy lies in making the church and its pastors more effective heralds of the Gospel, helping the priesthood of believers portray better examples of fruitful Christian living. The

52 Oates, *op. cit.*, p. 137.
53 Mattson, *op. cit.*, p. 292.

church must be more effective in counseling its young people to exercise greater care in the selection of lifetime marital partners. We must hold before people the higher ethic which asks "not what legal reasons are there which will enable me to get rid of the partner, if necessary; but rather, what means does God provide for us to do his will in such difficult circumstances."[54]

We must stress that a divorce always indicates a failure of faith. Piper feels that remarriages should not be conducted in public but in the privacy of a pastor's study, for this will remind the couple, as well as the fellowship of the saints, of the basic difference between the legal and the biblical concepts of marriage.[55] However one may feel about this, it is certainly imperative that the church's approach to remarriage be exercised with restraint and caution, yet never at the expense of bartering away its opportunity to restore the lost and wandering to the fold of Christ's lambs with the admonition of the Lord of the church, "Go, and sin no more."

54 Piper, in *Pulpit Digest*, p. 17.
55 *Ibid.*, p. 18.

Preaching to Young People

By Leslie Conrad, Jr.

ONE of our better known preachers was the featured preacher at a recent synodical Luther League convention. Within a few minutes after he had laid aside his vestments our paths crossed—unfortunately. As he shook my hand, he commented: "You know, this service today was a great disappointment to me; today's youth are not very appreciative. Just a few years ago I addressed this same synodical convention. I remember that one! I hope I can forget this one!"

As quickly as I could I smilingly changed the subject because I was convinced that this worthy gentleman was not in the mood to appreciate my blunt thoughts of the moment. And my conscience has scolded me ever since for not having faced the situation head-on! Allow me to salve my conscience somewhat by telling you what was wrong with the preacher and his sermon.

In the first place, he preached a barrel sermon. Now, there's nothing wrong with a good barrel sermon—I have a few stashed away in my barrel—but this particular convention preacher dusted off the one he had delivered just three days earlier in his home pulpit on the Gospel for the day. He ignored the convention theme completely, despite the fact that he was the so-called "convention key-noter." There was no evidence of even the slightest attempt to adapt his message to meet the needs of the occasion.

His second mistake was that his twenty-one minute pulpit offering was completely devoid of illustrative material—with two exceptions, and he might as well have left those two exceptions where he found them! They were some tid-bits of classical literature that he had apparently lodged in his memory box during his college days in English Lit. 3 or 4.

His third preaching sin for young people was that he followed his manuscript as closely as if he were reading it in its entirety.

His fourth blunder was that he spoke in generalities rather than specifics, in the abstract rather than in the concrete.

Finally, he erred unforgivably when he failed to toss out even a single worthwhile challenge to more than 250 youth who were seated before him.

In defense of "unappreciative youth" it must be stated that when he preached to a synodical gathering a few years earlier his audience had been composed of many, many more grown-ups who still considered themselves to be "young people." And apparently it had been the older crowd that had provided a sufficiency of hand-shaking and back-slapping to make him return home brimming with pride. Sooner or later—but probably never—this brother of the cloth is

going to have to swallow one hard fact: *today's teen-agers are boldly honest!* When their souls have been stirred with a spirit-swelling experience, they will show it in the position of their heads and eyes—the best sign as to whether you are scoring or striking out! If their noggins begin to bob and weave and their peepers begin to search out the cobwebs on the ceiling or the blond soprano in the choir, then you know that the time has arrived to move into a higher gear with a different type of frontal attack.

Teen-agers do not give a rap what size congregation you serve, or how many committees you have chaired, or the record number of audiences you have held breathless in the good old days—or even recent days. Unless you can speak to youth's needs of the present moment, you have wasted their time. And time is too precious to waste, especially youth's time!

Actually, there is no such thing as a "preacher to young people." I am convinced that the credentials for preaching to youth effectively are the same as those for preaching to the entire family—father, mother, grandparents, uncles, aunts, in-laws, and out-laws. As far as I am concerned, the preacher who cannot preach to youth simply cannot preach. For if young people are unable to understand, it is a foregone conclusion that the adults of the congregation have also smogged out. There are some exceptions to this rather general, catch-all statement, but it will definitely hold true in the typical parish.

One of the Ten Commandments for public speaking promulgated by my college professor in that department went something like this: "Speak to the simplest intelligence in your audience, and you will hit everything higher up." Long before I was handed a neatly-ribboned ordination certificate, I had revised this just-mentioned public speaking commandment to read: "Speak to the average intelligence in your audience, and you will hit everything worth hitting that is higher up or lower down."

When I was a parish preacher I employed the revised version of my favorite college professor's commandment about ninety-five per cent of the time. On a few occasions I found it necessary to deviate in the hope of coping with adult-centered problems.

The procedures, techniques, and strategies that I shall recommend are a dukes mixture of the following four experiences: (1) Sixteen years of pre-college sermon-listening to the pulpit offerings of a top-flight preacher-father; (2) six and one-half years of parish pulpit work; (3) six years of preaching and speech-making before all types of youth under all kinds of conditions; (4) several summers of side-line questionnairing among Lutheran youth about the very subject at hand.

Today's typical Lutheran young person likes to sing in church and he appreciates hearing the Word of God read in church—providing it is read well; that is to say, slowly and distinctly enough for its meaning to be understood.

(Parenthetically, the average young Lutheran prefers that his pastor read from a modern translation of the Scriptures.) He also likes to pray in church—both silently and audibly. But most important for today's Miss Josephine Lutheran and her cousin Mr. Joe Lutheran is the sermon. In fact, today's church-going youth rate the sermon in a class all by itself.

1. *The Text and Subject.* Is the text important? Surprisingly, it is! On the average, you will find only one Lutheran youth out of forty who does not give a high rating to the sermon text. But having said this much, it must also be reported that young people want short texts—much shorter than they are getting from their preachers. Their reason for wanting a shorter text is simple: If it is short, they will have something to peg their religion on during the week that follows.

The sermon subject is of secondary value. Only when the text is unduly lengthy, or in cases where the sermon is textless, is the subject of notable importance.

2. *Illustrations.* It may seem a bit strange that a seminary graduate would be so bold as to place illustrations this early in a discussion of "sermons for young people." For have not all seminarians been advised that "illustrations are mere windows that shed light on the architectural beauty of the sermonic building?" Yes, this is so! But church-attending Lutheran youth have not majored in homiletics. In fact, only a handful of them knows that the subject is taught. But this much they do know: Illustrations are an essential part of every sermon. Young people are almost unanimous in their desire for appropriate illustrative material. My own questioning on the matter reveals that 98 out of every 100 Lutheran youth make illustrations a "must part" of every sermon.

And they are choosy about their illustrations. They prefer three types of illustrations: (1) Events with which they can associate themselves; (2) current happenings; (3) experiences of other young people of the present or the past. Many young people have keen interest in the field of sports. Historical events usually rate very high. However, excerpts of an illustrative nature from drama and literature pack very little punch. As for poetry—that stuff that fills too much space in modern sermons—we shall versify our comments:

Poems in sermons for church-going youth,
Be they fiction or fact or gospel truth,
Are king-size dosages of chloroform,
Though some preachers think them to be the norm.

Your favorite bit of quotable verse
Nine times in ten throws your speech in reverse
Unless it's simple as "Little Boy Blue"
Or the "mom who bred her brood in a shoe."

Trying to preach to young people without an adequate sprinkling of top-drawer illustrations is like trying to take a bath without water. No preacher in the northern part of the United States attracts as many teen-age listeners to his youth rallies as Jack Wyrtzen. He usually holds forth for two hours and twenty minutes—that is par for *his* course. Admittedly, "The Jack Wyrtzen Show" would not be acceptable to Lutheran churches, even though he worms his way into one occasionally. Jack Wyrtzen can preach—no one falls asleep while Jack's on the platform. Some of his preaching contains too many shovelfuls of hell-fire and damnation; the scare-'em-into-heaven-and-out-of-hell attack is employed in most of his sermons. However, despite many objectionable preaching features, Wyrtzen never forgets his audience. He has scads and scads of illustrations—and he knows how to use them! They are fresh and factual, involving young people. He does not talk about sweet old ladies or gurgling babies; he talks about lively and healthy American youth who have corresponding characteristics with those who are crowded on the chairs in front of him.

The ability to illustrate effectively does not come easily. Personally, I have found Clovis Chappell's volumes of sermons to be my best printed guides in developing a proper technique for illustrating sermons. Now retired, Clovis Chappell was probably the most popular preacher in the South during the past twenty-five years and doubtless reached more people through pulpits in the South than any other minister. This statement does not mean that he was always heard "in person," but it does mean that he had a wide hearing. The fact that he published more than twenty-five volumes of sermons by the time he retired from the active ministry is an indication that somebody was buying and reading his books, and probably adapting them for preaching purposes. During the six and one-half years that I served in North Carolina, no preacher was more often referred to in ministerial bull sessions than Clovis Chappell. The reason was simple: Chappell's books of sermons were ministerial best sellers, and they were constantly being "employed."

Chappell mastered the art of illustrating sermons. One of his best volumes is one of his later works, *If I Were Young,* a book of sermons for young people. I have made several trips through the volume in collecting the following illustration data:

According to my figures, the volume contains 3,824 lines of type. Of this amount, 3,137 lines contain illustrative material. At first, I could hardly believe these figures to be true. However, after double-checking and returning to the volume to note the lines in the margin—I extended a line in the margin for the full length of each illustration—I am satisfied that my calculations are fairly accurate.

It probably should be stated at this juncture that this book of sermons for young people is filled with more illustrative material than any of Chappell's other

books that I have perused. In a way, then, it is not a fair picture of what Chappell's average illustrative content is per book. However, on the other hand, it demonstrates how heavily he leans on illustrative material when preaching to teen-agers.

There are 275 illustrations in the volume according to my count. I have grouped them into seven types.

Type of Illustration		*No. of Illustrations*
1. Biblical		105
a) New Testament	73	
b) Old Testament	32	
2. Personal Experiences		65
3. Hypothetical Cases		44
4. Literature		23
5. Biography		9
6. Poetry		16
7. General Illustrations		13

It should be of interest to us Lutherans who place so much emphasis on the Bible to note that Illustration-Specialist Chappell has a total of 105 illustrations from the Scriptures. He is teaching the Bible to young people while he is preaching, without informing them what he is up to! He has an uncanny knack of making biblical material fresh and alive. In fact, sometimes he is almost "finished" with an illustration before you realize that "this is an illustration right out of God's Word, rephrased in today's language."

The length of Chappell's illustrations averages 10 lines (or 110 words) apiece. Only two illustrations in the entire book go beyond 45 lines.

In addition to the 275 illustrations, I noted 129 "illustrationettes." These are "shorties" of two, three, or four lines. Here is a typical example: "It is said that the personal presence of Julius Caesar could change the most commonplace soldier into a hero."

Chappell and a little humor now and then get along very well. As long as humor comes naturally, and is not forced or superficial or artificial, there is a definite place for it in preaching to young people. Here is a typical example from Chappell: "When I was a boy on the farm we raised chickens and ducks, geese and turkeys. At least we tried to raise turkeys. If you have ever experimented with this bird, you know there is nothing that a young turkey likes quite so well as to die."

It may appear that I am dwelling too long-windedly on illustrations. I am not! The time and type that I have devoted to the importance of illustrations is a planned maneuver to impress upon the reader the inestimable value of illustrative material when preaching to youth.

3. *Subject Matter.* It has long been rumored that young people are not interested in listening to doctrinal sermons. This charge is unfounded and untrue.

Teen-agers appreciate knowing exactly where their church stands on subjects of faith and conscience, and why it stands where it does! However, they conscientiously confess that much of the theological terminology used by their ministers fails to register for even a moment.

Despite the fact that the Lutheran Church takes pride in its thorough catechetical instruction, drilled into youth prior to confirmation, more than seventy per cent of today's average group of church-going Lutheran teen-agers cannot define such often-employed pulpit terms as grace, faith, redemption, sanctification, and justification.

Two German exchange students who attended one of our seminaries this past year were granted the privilege of sizing up their year's experience in the last issue of the seminary's news sheet. They found much that was praiseworthy; but they were honest. They chided their fellow seminarians for spending so much time in re-telling New Testament parables and completely ignoring the glaring truth that we are living in the twentieth century and not the first.

Today's young people want facts, facts, and more facts. This is no time for mouthing abstractions and generalities from the pulpit. Biblical facts, doctrinal facts, how-to-live-today facts. Youth delights in listening to a preacher who knows his subject *factually!*

A word of caution: Beware of the opinions you express in the pulpit! Young people seldom bother to dissociate the preacher from the Word of God which he preaches. In fact, 46% of the young people that I have polled or interviewed actually prefer the preacher's opinion to the printed word of the writer of Scripture—just in case there should be a difference of opinion. It is a frightening, yes, sobering, revelation, indicating how closely young people link their preachers with the men of God who wrote the Bible.

4. *Sermon Delivery.* If a minister expects to get maximum results from his preaching to youth, he will leave his manuscript—as well as his notes—in his work room. He will operate on a heart-to-heart, eye-to-eye basis every moment of the time he is preaching to young people. There is no question in the minds of youth that the sermon which does the most good is the sermon which is preached without notes. Direct appeal is of prime importance. Who could picture Jesus reading the Sermon on the Mount or the account of the Prodigal Son?

Preaching without notes grants the preacher a joy that he could never experience by being tied to a note-filled presentation guide. And when a preacher enjoys his preaching, it is pretty certain that his congregation will also! Any preacher can preach without notes, providing he believes that it is the best way to preach and is willing to labor until he masters the art.

Whoever spread the word around that very few pew-sitters are saved after the first twenty minutes of the sermon did not consult present-day church-attending youth about the matter. Only one out of seven young Lutherans is satisfied

with a twenty-minute sermon. Four out of seven prefer that the minister just forget the time element altogether, providing, of course, that he is going to have something worth saying.

And while preaching—whether it be twenty or thirty minutes—it is important to speak in a natural voice. The "holy tone" or the "artificial twang" is unacceptable to more than 97% of young sermon-digesters. Voice affectations for all parts of the service—liturgy, Scripture, prayer, or sermon—are anathema.

The Progressive Farmer, the South's leading farm magazine, recently conducted a letter-writing contest for its teen-age readers. They were asked to write a brief statement on the subject, "What I like about my Pastor." Here are the statements of the three winners:

First youth: "In his first service our pastor said, 'I'm on your side and will always go to bat for my youth.' He has done just that. A fellow can't lose when he has a pastor like mine."

Second youth: "My pastor expounds the Gospel in such a simple way that even the children understand it. He always knows the right words to say."

Third youth: "My pastor teaches the way 'we' should live, not the way 'you' should live. His sincerity inspires his congregation, especially the young people, and he really 'practices what he preaches.'"

The Beginning of Jesus' Ministry in Luke

By Eric H. Wahlstrom

WHEN the evangelist Luke begins to relate the ministry of Jesus, he puts together a number of incidents which are significant, not only in themselves, but also as a group. In a certain sense they furnish an introduction to and a program for the whole gospel. We are concerned here especially with the preaching of John the Baptist, the baptism of Jesus, the temptation, and the visit to Nazareth.

John the Baptist proclaimed the coming Messiah as an apocalyptic judge. This coming One "has his winnowing fork in his hand, to clear his threshing floor, and to gather the wheat into his granary, but the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire." He speaks of "the wrath to come," and he declares that "the ax is laid to the root of the trees; every tree therefore that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire." This is the traditional imagery of the Old Testament "day of Jehovah," the great and terrible day, the day of judgment and the establishment of the final kingdom. There is no intimation at all of a Messiah who is like the Suffering Servant, or who is to suffer and die for the sins of the world. (The testimony in John 1:29, "Behold the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world," evidently comes from a later period after the baptism of Jesus.)

Since all four gospels begin the story of the ministry of Jesus at the same point, and all refer to the preaching and baptism of Jesus, we may infer that the excitement and expectation aroused by this movement became a call to Jesus to leave his home in Nazareth and to seek his own place in this development. He came and was baptized by John. It is quite evident that all the evangelists attach great importance to this experience of Jesus, and that it marked the beginning of his messianic activity. It is precarious for us to try to fathom the consciousness of Jesus or to speculate on what went on in his mind. But the baptism experience must have had a meaning also for him. Whatever he had thought and known before of the mystery of his person and destiny, now he knew that he was the Holy One of God whom God had appointed as his Anointed, the Messiah, the Agent of redemption. The voice from heaven quoting a passage from the Old Testament expresses this conviction of his appointment. Through his baptism he was called, commissioned, and installed in the office of the Messiah. Of course, Luke does not at all suggest that Jesus *became* the Son of God in baptism. The infancy stories indicate that he stands in the tradition which held that "God sent the Son into the world." But as the Incarnate he received at the time of his baptism the call and the appointment to the messianic office. This event also meant,

of course, that he accepted this office, that he assumed the burden of man's sin, and that he identified himself with humanity.

He was the Anointed of the Lord, the Messiah. But how should the messianic ministry be carried out? There were many popular, Jewish conceptions of the Messiah and of his work. This was the temptation. The Spirit took him out into the wilderness among the wild beasts. In popular understanding the wilderness was the home of the demons, and wild beasts stand for the enemies of God. The messianic struggle with the powers of evil begins as soon as he has received his appointment. His call was a call to the messianic office, and he must begin at once.

What kind of Messiah? In Jewish expectations the Messiah would inaugurate an age of plenty. Palestine was not a fertile country. Only a small part of the land could be tilled. The supply of food was never abundant. Even at best the people lived on a subsistence level. But in the messianic age all would be changed. Then the land would again flow with milk and honey, the harvest would follow on the heels of the sower, and all would eat and be satisfied. Relieve poverty, make the land fruitful, give the people bread! Give them what they expect, and you will have won their heart! But Jesus answers that sin is not removed by plenty, nor by social and economic programs. Man lives not by bread alone, but by the word of God.

Then the devil took him up and promised to deliver the nations into his power. The Jews had suffered under various world rulers, and the Romans were now the oppressors. But when the Messiah comes, he will lead the people of God in a victorious assault on the enemies, and Israel shall become the ruler of the world under the King Messiah. Then the faithfulness of the people of God will be rewarded, and the adversaries will be destroyed. But Jesus answers that salvation cannot be attained by violence and power, but by the spirit of God.

One more suggestion is made: Come to the temple, descend from on high into the multitude assembled at the annual Passover feast, and they will acclaim you as their king. This, too, was expected. The Messiah would come suddenly out of nowhere to his temple (John 7:27; Mal. 3:1), and then they would know unmistakably who he was. But redemption is not accomplished by magic or miracle. Man cannot put God to a test. God himself alone decides the way of salvation.

So far the story is negative. Jesus rejected all these suggestions as a program for the Messiah. No matter how popular these suggestions might be, and even if they could be supported by quotations from the Scriptures, they were false. He was not called to be that kind of Messiah.

Luke inserts here the story of Jesus' visit to Nazareth. It is clear that this is out of context, and that it occurred at a later date in the ministry. The other gospels report it later, and Luke himself indicates that Jesus had already carried on a ministry in Capernaum before he appeared here in Nazareth (4:23). It is

evident, therefore, that Luke has placed this story here for a specific purpose. It is designed to give a positive clue to the purpose and program of the ministry of Jesus.

Jesus "found" a passage in the prophecy of Isaiah. It is possible that he himself selected it, but it may also have been the lesson from the prophets appointed for that day. At any rate the passage speaks of One anointed by the Lord who is to preach good news to the poor, release the captives, give sight to the blind, liberate the oppressed, and proclaim the year of the favor of the Lord. This, then, is God's own intention for his Messiah. Man's expectations and desires were not to be trusted. Only Scripture itself could furnish a trustworthy guide. God has determined the course for his Anointed, and he has set it in the pattern of the great prophet of the Exile. Now the purpose and intention of God are to be fulfilled. "Today this Scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing."

But he knew that their conception of the messianic fulfillment was similar to those which he had already rejected. He was not their kind of Messiah. They understood the implications of his words and became angry. They led him to "the brow of the hill" (most likely a place of execution) and intended to throw him down. Their action becomes a symbol of the rejection which will be more decisive and official later on, and of the place called Golgotha where he will ultimately die.

Later on in the gospel (*7:22*) this conception of Jesus' ministry is reiterated. John had proclaimed the coming of an apocalyptic judge and later had spoken about "the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world." But at this time of the ministry in Galilee, Jesus did not seem to fit either one of these concepts. He was rather a popular figure who might be induced to become a king. John sent from prison to ask him: "Are you he who is to come, or shall we look for another?" Jesus' answer is practically a repetition of the prophecy quoted in the synagogue in Nazareth. And here, too, we find a note of opposition and conflict: "Blessed is he who takes no offense at me."

The story of the rejection in Nazareth stands as a prologue, a text, an introduction to the gospel of Luke, and the subsequent content of the gospel is really a commentary on this text. Jesus goes about to heal, to give sight, to restore life, and to preach the gospel to the poor. He is God's Anointed, and he goes the way appointed for him. He has been called and appointed to carry out the redemptive purpose and intention of God and to fulfill "all Scripture" in which this purpose of God has been disclosed. With masterly literary skill Luke indicates at the very beginning of the ministry the choice which Jesus had to make and the program which he accepted. According to popular expectation he was a strange Messiah whose actions seemed to belie his claims. But Luke sets his ministry in the broad frame and perspective of the eternal counsel of God's redemptive purpose as that purpose had been revealed in the Scriptures and especially in the great prophecy of the Suffering Servant.

What Makes Good Hymns?

By L. David Miller

HYMNS are humble works of art that exert wide influence. Some hymns have been sung in every major language for hundreds of years. However, their very popularity and simplicity are chalked up against them. The poetry of the hymn is often as brief as the quatrain; the hymn tune is the shortest form of musical literature. Yet hymns may be of immortal significance to peasants, factory workers, white collar people, or scholars. All alike acknowledge the strange power of hymns to lead to the threshold of heaven.

The hymn as an art form has its limitations, but every art is limited by the materials at hand. The sculptor is limited to stone, metal, wood, or clay. The artist is limited to his paints and canvas. The composer is limited to paper and instruments. It is the great artist who can be disciplined by the limitations to produce a masterpiece. The lines of Wordsworth might well apply to hymn writers:

> If thou indeed derive thy light from heaven,
> Then to the measure of that heaven-born gift
> Shine, poet, . . . in thy place and be content.

The hymn writer is challenged to produce good poetry that will make an effective hymn. Many excellent poems would not make good hymns. As Alfred B. Haas has said, "One cannot imagine any congregation, however erudite, singing Francis Thompson's 'Hound of Heaven' or T. S. Eliot's 'Ash Wednesday.'" A partial explanation comes from Tennyson, who said, "A good hymn is the most difficult thing in the world to write. In a good hymn you have to be both commonplace and poetical."

The poetry in the hymn must reach the heart of the singer and direct his thoughts heavenward. It should not sink to the level of doggerel. Neither should it soar into the realm of the symbolical. It must be simple, singable, and readily understood. Word pictures and imagery cannot demand sustained thought, but must be obvious in their meaning. The poem must move along with the music.

The artistry of the hymn writer is further tested by the limitations of metrical forms. The hymn is set to regular time. All of the remaining stanzas must be strictly in accord with the first. If there is a change in the rhythm or mood during the first stanza, all subsequent stanzas must make the same change to fit the hymn tune, which is the same for all stanzas. The Greek Lenten poem by Andrew of Crete, translated by John Mason Neale as "Christian, Dost Thou See Them," has contrasting thought content in each stanza. The first half asks

questions expressing terror, weariness, and impatience. The second half of each stanza gives a positive reply, affirming the Christian's ability to conquer temptations. The tune by John B. Dykes complements the emotional contrast of the poem and makes a striking change of pace and mood.

The composer of the hymn tune has similar limitations. He must create a melody that will fit the words, that will appeal to men, women, and children, some of whom are musically educated but most of whom are musically illiterate. It must have rhythm and harmony that will appeal to this varied group and must be conducive to worship. The tune should not call attention to itself but should complement the words. The hymn must sound churchly and must stir the emotions. The quality of the music should make the singer conscious of realities which are deeper than mere words can express. Hymnody as an art form reaches its zenith when good poetry lifts man to God and when the music gives it wings to soar into infinity.

Hymns are theological textbooks of the layman. Martin Luther made successful use of hymns as a teaching technique. While criticizing Luther, a Roman Catholic priest paid tribute to the importance of hymn singing in spreading the teachings of the Reformation. He said that Martin Luther damned more souls by his singing than he did by his preaching. Luther set his understanding of the Gospel to music and the people sang his hymns in the churches, in the streets, and up and down the countryside.

Hymns may also be used today to communicate the teachings of the church. The popular hymn, "Come, Thou Almighty King," presents the doctrine of the Trinity. The first stanza is addressed to the first person in the Godhead, the "almighty King," the "Father all-glorious." The second stanza refers to Jesus Christ, the "incarnate Word." The third stanza deals with the "Holy Comforter," the "Spirit of power." The last stanza summarizes the doctrine of the Trinity, "great One in Three." How unwise it is for any leader to omit any stanza of this type of hymn! To sing the first and last stanzas of "Come, Thou Almighty King" would eliminate the second and third persons of the Trinity. A brief explanation of the message of the hymn would encourage a congregation to be eager to sing the hymn in its entirety. It is shocking to discover that many people do not make an effort to grasp the spiritual message of the hymn. The singing of a hymn may degenerate into a sanctified seventh-inning stretch. Relaxation and entertainment are not the purpose of hymn singing.

Some hymns are popular because of the tunes rather than because of the words. If the tune has such a "catchy" rhythm or melodic pattern that it calls attention to itself at the expense of the words, it is not a good tune. Tunes that appeal to the feet instead of the heart detract from the worship of God.

Properly to appreciate a good hymn, it is well to understand the author and his reason for writing the hymn. Morgan Phelps Noyes has pointed out that one

cannot really understand "O Love That Wilt Not Let Me Go" if one does not know the story of George Matheson's blindness. It is also well to know the historical situation out of which hymns arose. Some of the hymns of Luther are better appreciated when one is aware of his controversy with the Roman Church and with certain left-wing Reformers. To understand the biblical background of hymns based on Scripture passages will of course also give insight to deeper meanings. Leaders in worship can improve congregational singing and understanding by explaining pertinent facts about hymns instead of announcing an "old favorite" and challenging the congregation to "rattle the rafters."

Worship should be God-centered, not man-centered. It is not easy to think of hymns consistently in terms of worship instead of entertainment. Indeed, it is quite possible to go through the motions of worship without actually experiencing it. One may "repeat" the Lord's Prayer without giving God a thought. We should not forget, as Kierkegaard has said, that God is the audience. Augustine's requirement that a hymn should be praise to God in song still applies.

Hymns are also concerned with people—ourselves and others—and must be relevant to the whole of Christian living. The danger is to lay too much stress on oneself. Hymns like "I Am Thine, O Lord," "Beulah Land," and "In the Garden" fail to measure up to the requirements of a good hymn. The tunes are inferior musically and call attention to the singers rather than to God. The words are sentimental, subjective, and hardly suitable for corporate worship. Indeed, if one were to substitute the name of a sweetheart for God in the song "In the Garden," it might soon be heard on every juke box in the country.

In all fairness, let it be understood that some hymns that are musically and poetically mediocre may be more acceptable to God when sincerely sung from the heart than a difficult chorale sung with musical finesse but with only an intellectual awareness. Hymnody needs variety in order to reach all types of people of varying degrees of musical and spiritual development. Everyone must be led to worship God. No one would silence the congregation in order to reach artistic perfection. However, after recognizing the level of prevailing taste, a gradual effort should be made to lift the standards.

The great hymns of the church will continue to express the fellowship of believers and inspire deep spiritual feeling. But we cannot be satisfied with hymns of the past. We must also create new hymns in fresh contemporary form looking toward the future.

Desert Wisdom: The Sayings of the Anchorites

By Edwin C. Tappert

APOPHTHEGMATA, the edifying utterances of Christian ascetics who lived for the most part in the deserts of Egypt and the Sinaitic peninsula, have come down to us in several languages and from diverse sources.[1] Although, due to their popularity at the time, there were later accretions, the main body of our apophthegmatic literature stems, in its oral tradition, from a period roughly between A.D. 350 and 450.

Because of the scope of this literature, no complete and definitive edition of apophthegmata has ever been published. The best known collection in Greek is the recension printed in Migne, *P.G.*, LXV, pp. 71-440.[2] Related to this Greek version is the Latin collection printed in Migne, *P.L.*, LXXIII and LXXIV, under the title *Vitae Patrum*.[3] There exist also collections in Syriac,[4] Coptic,[5] Aramaic,[6] and Armenian.[7]

The accounts given below in English translation have been chosen for publication here not because they were thought to represent a cross-section of the genre, but rather because they are among the least known. They have not been published before either in Greek or in Latin, nor have they appeared in trans-

1 Wilhelm Bousset, *Apophthegmata: Studien zur Geschichte des ältesten Mönchtums* (Tübingen, 1923), deals most fully with the tradition of manuscript sources and their relative authority.

2 Here the apophthegmata are arranged in alphabetical order on the basis of the names of the holy men to whom they are attributed. I cite selections from this in my notes by referring to the name and the number of the account under it. A large collection of apophthegmata was made by Paulus Euergetinus in the eleventh century and published under the title *Synagoge ton theophthongon rhematon kai didaskalion ton theophthoron kai hagion pateron,* ed. A. S. Georgios (Athens, 1901).

3 Helen Waddell very ably translated into English a selection from this work in *The Desert Fathers* (London, 1936).

4 Bedjan, *Acta Martyrum,* VII (Paris, 1897). English versions are given by E. A. Wallis Budge, *Paradise of the Holy Fathers* (London, 1907), *Stories of the Holy Fathers* (London, 1934), and *Wit and Wisdom of the Egyptian Fathers* (London, 1934).

5 P. M. Chaine, *Mélanges de la Faculté orientale,* V, 2 (1912), p. 548; Zoëga, *Catalogus codicum copticorum manuscriptorum qui in Museo Borgiano Velitris asservantur* (Rome, 1810); Theodor Hopfner, *Ueber die koptisch-sahidischen Apophthegmata* (Vienna, 1918); and O. Lemm, "Kleine koptische Studien," in *Mém. de l'Acad. de St. Petersbourg,* VIII. The Coptic fragments parallel the Latin recension of Pelagius-Johannes in Migne, *P.L.,* LXXIII and LXXIV.

6 Dünsing, *Christlich-palästinisch-aramäische Texte und Fragmente* (Göttingen, 1906), p. 15.

7 "Sayings and Narrations of the Holy Fathers," in *The Writings of the Holy Fathers and their Way of Living* (Venice, 1855), I, pp. 413-722; II, pp. 1-504 (Armenian text).

lation into a modern language. Their source is the collection of apophthegmata in a Greek manuscript in the archives of the Library Company of Philadelphia (Greek Commentary 1141), there loosely described as "A History of Abbots, Priests, and Monks." The translations given below are based only on the text of this one manuscript.[8]

72v2. As we were coming to Rhaithu, some brothers related to us that there was a certain industrious monk who dwelt in the caves above what is called Israel, and the mind of the monk was so alert that almost with every step he took abroad, wheresoever indeed he was standing, he always examined his thoughts[9] and asked himself, 'How now, my good brother, where are we?' If he found that his mind was reciting psalms or praying, well and good. But if he found himself reflecting upon any alien matter at all, he immediately began to beat himself,[10] saying: 'Away from that, and with thy head down concentrate on thy work!' And so the monk was forever saying to himself, 'Brother, the hour of thy departure from life is nigh, and even now I perceive nothing intervening.'

Once Satan appeared to this monk and said to him: "Why dost thou toil? Believe me, thou art not saving thyself." And he said to him: "It is no concern to thee if I be saved or not; at least I find myself standing over thy head, even though under all in hell."[11]

8 They are introduced by folio number and line. For a fuller account of this manuscript, its provenience and contents, see my article, "A Greek Hagiologic Manuscript in Philadelphia," in *Transactions of the American Philological Association,* LXVIII (1937), pp. 264-276.

9 It was a common belief among the monks that the Devil, or demons, tempted them by entering into and directing their thoughts (*logismoi*). Consequently a monk whose thoughts were sinful regarded himself as at war with a very real adversary lodged in a distinct part of his being. So in this account the monk's *logismoi,* with his *nous,* are a unit separate from that self which is held accountable for his conduct. This psychological interpretation is frequently implied in apophthegmata in which we find demon-fraught thoughts not only recognized by a troubled monk, but even speaking to him, and being addressed in turn by the monk. See Karl Heussi, *Der Ursprung des Mönchtums* (Tübingen, 1936), pp. 257-258.

10 The Greek *hybrizen* implies that the monk used violence upon himself as a means of correction. The generally accepted statement of Rufus M. Jones in Hastings' *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, s.v.* "Flagellants," that voluntary flagellation "does not appear to have been practiced in the early Christian period or even in the early days of monasticism" is subject to question. Our MS. 76r15-25 tells of a monk who resorted to penitential scourging with a whip of harsh cord until he wept from pain. "The noble athlete who for Christ tortures himself" was crowned like the martyrs.

11 Constant watchfulness and self-examination, typified by the monk in this account, were prescribed as a precaution against the encroachment of sinful thoughts and formed a phase of the anchorite's ascetic discipline. To understand and appreciate the apophthegmata correctly one must bear in mind the eschatological basis which underlies the thinking of the monks in early Christian times. The imminence of death, with its fear of judgment and eternal damnation, was always prominent in their minds. Their piety was influenced by their emphasis upon this notion, and in it was found justification for their depreciation of the present world in favor of an enhancement of the next. The "fear of God" often receives greater prominence than the "love of God," and its attainment was equally sought after. See below, MS. 79v3. The

73r10. Again the monk said: "A monk, when he is with brothers, ought always to look down toward the ground and never to look upon a man's face, and especially not upon that of a young man. But when, on the other hand, he is alone, let him look only upward, for the demons are much distressed and afraid whenever we look up to the Lord."[12]

74r6. The labors[13] of man, unless they have humility, themselves destroy

fact that Satan here—demons and angels in other apophthegmata—is made to play an important part must be recognized as a frequently employed device. Often the rôle which these supernatural characters play is clearly to be attributed to the adoption by the authors of a literary form. Their inclusion is a dramatic medium for enhancing and giving force to an account. They appear rarely in the true and simple apophthegmata, but they become common, and are attended by miraculous phenomena, in those later accounts which tended to take on a narrative or novelistic character. When, on the other hand, monks tell of seeing supernatural phenomena in their dreams or in a state of ecstasy, their words are to be received at face value. The nature and authenticity of visions among monks are discussed by Alois Mager in "Beschauung und Vision," *Zeitschrift für Aszese und Mystik,* I (1926), pp. 38-44, and by Robert de Sinéty, "Voyants ou Visionnaires," *Revue d'ascétique et de mystique,* VIII (1927), pp. 132-156. The important observation to make is that the vision of a monk might be regarded by his brothers as God-sent. It was believed that some monks had insight into heavenly things through a special dispensation, or grace, of God. They were *gnostikoi* and *pneumatophoroi,* and credence was given to their revelations. It is in the assurance of this unusual power that we find the basis for the practice among the monks of addressing questions of a religious or ethical nature to certain fathers with the expectation of receiving divinely inspired edification. See MS. 80r12 below. On the whole subject of supernatural visions and powers see Richard Reitzenstein, "Historia Monachorum und Historia Lausiaca: Eine Studie zur Geschichte des Mönchtums und der frühchristlichen Begriffe Gnostiker und Pneumatiker," *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen, 1916), Vol. 7.

12 The practice of directing one's glance to the ground was an outward manifestation of humility among the monks. It was also a safeguard against the temptations and disconcerting interests of the world. The fear of temptation *eis porneian* by demon-inspired thoughts is frequently alluded to, a fact which suggests the prevalence of sexual perversion among the ancient ascetics. The young and the beardless were to be excluded from the habitations of monks. The anchorites regularly wore beards, not to abide by the dictum of ancient philosophy to live in accordance with nature, but to avoid any suggestion of the feminine sex. Reitzenstein, *Hist. Mon.,* p. 95, note 1, states on the authority of Epiphanius, "Adversus Haereses," 80, 7 (Migne, *P.G.* XCII, pp. 765-768), that the wearing of a beard was required of a monk and that in Palestine at the time of Sabas it became law to receive no beardless person in a cell. Karl Heussi, *Ursprung,* pp. 227-228, suggests that the alteration of representations of Christ in Christian art of the fourth century from beardless to bearded may have been prescribed as a precaution against sexual perversion.

13 By labors (*kopoi*) are meant the hardships of mind and body which made up the ascetic discipline of the monks. A fairly comprehensive anchoretic interpretation is given in Anthony 33: "Hold the fear of God before thine eyes. Be mindful of him who mortifies and vivifies (cf. II Kings 5:7). Hate the world and all things in it. Hate every ease of the flesh. Renounce this life that thou mayest dwell in God. Remember what thou hast promised God, for he demands it of thee on Judgment Day. Hunger and thirst, be naked and sleepless, mourn, bewail and groan in thy heart. Make trial of thyself to determine whether thou art worthy of God. Despise thy flesh that thou mayest save thy soul." The precaution that all ascetic labors be done with humility is characteristic of the apophthegmata. In the apophthegmata which immediately pre-

him, for many, like the Pharisee, come to arrogance on account of the great labors which they do.

74r11. A rather negligent brother dwelt with a certain great monk. Seeing that the monk ate only once each week, he said to him: "Father, some say that great abstinence brings some persons to arrogance." The monk said to him: "Not at all, my child. If humility comes through neglect, let us depart [from the desert] and take even women unto ourselves and eat meat and drink wine. Woe to us, my children! How we deceive ourselves and know it not! We do not give ear to David when he says, 'Look upon my humility and my labor, and forgive all my sins.'[14] For he who has sinned against God ought to withdraw from every love of man until he has been fully assured that he has become a friend of God; for the love of men often separates us from the love of God."

74v11. A monk said: "When a brother wishes to go to a brother, the demon of slander either seizes him beforehand where he is or comes with him to the brother himself."[15]

74v14. Again he said: "Nothing is worse than a bad habit, for the man afflicted with a bad habit needs time and much labor to rid himself of it. The toil, indeed, many have, but few receive the time. Others are quickly smitten by death, and God alone knows what he intends to do with them on Judgment Day."

ceded this account in our MS. we read: "Humility often, even without labor, saves many. Witnesses of this are the Publican and the Prodigal Son who, though they said but few words, were saved."

14 Psalm 25:18. Unlike the present citation, biblical quotations often lack literal accuracy in the apophthegmata. The possession of a Bible was not required of anchorites. Many, indeed, were illiterate, a fact which helps to explain the origin and popularity of the apophthegmata among them. Though some accounts directly advocate the study of the Scriptures and Christian doctrine, others imply that the reading of the Bible may lead men to false interpretations. So MS. 74r9 states: "Prating about faith and accurately knowing dogmas dries up a man's contrition and utterly blots it out. But the Lives and Words of the fathers enlighten the soul." References, direct or indirect, to the Old and New Testaments are nevertheless frequent, as might be expected. Especially attractive in Old Testament literature were those characters who might be pointed to as champions of virtues which loomed large in the estimation of the desert fathers, such as Daniel, David, Job, Joseph, and Noah. Those parts of the New Testament which set forth rigorous ethical commands, like the Sermon on the Mount and the synoptic Gospels, are especially prominent.

15 Slander was a common subject for exposition by the fathers. It is in the fear of expressing slanderous thoughts that we may find motivation for the ideal of silence. Agathon heroically kept a stone in his mouth for three years to attain this end (Agathon 15). A definition of slander is given in our MS., 98r10: "If thou sayest, 'Such-and-such a brother is zealous and understanding, but—if it maks any difference—a bit careless,' lo, thou hast slandered him. And if thou sayest that he is a liar and perjurer, this is condemnation, which is worse than slander."

74v18. A brother who dwelt in a cell by himself often became indifferent, for he had fallen into a grave sin. Then, grieving and not knowing what to do, he said, 'What is done is done.' And so he grieved until death overtook him.[16]

74r5. A monk said: "Even if a man see with his very own eyes, let him in no wise pass judgment upon anyone. One is the judge, the son of God. Every man who judges anyone is found to be condemned and impious toward Christ, for by becoming a judge he seizes the authority and the power which the Father gave to him."[17]

77r25. If thou obtain a Bible, do not adorn its covering; and do not obtain an expensive altar cloth for thy bowing in worship.[18]

77r28. Except only a proper cowl,[19] let no new garment be put on thy body.

77v4. If thou seest a vessel, a knife, a hoe, or any such thing at all, and thou seest that thou entertainest a fondness for it, cast it from thee that thou mayest teach thy thoughts to love absolutely nothing, except only Christ.[20]

16 The monks were sometimes inclined to yield to the temptation to relax their harsh ascetic exertions and to fall into indolence and neglect (*rhathumia*), which often led to ennui and a disinclination to carry on (*akedia*). This feeling is sometimes identified with "the destruction that wasteth at noonday" (Psalm 91:6) because it was in the heat of midday, several hours before the end of the ascetics' fasting hour at three o'clock, that they were especially affected by it. That such backsliding was common is indicated by the frequent allusions to it. The usual cure which the fathers prescribed was *"ora et labora,"* and the reward for observing the prescription was peace of mind and heart. Cf. MS. 78v26, below.

17 The biblical warning against passing judgment is frequently re-echoed in the apophthegmata in close association with the injunction against slandering and the anchorite's ideal of self-degradation and humility. Typical is the short but forceful utterance of the monk in MS. 88r24: "A holy man, upon seeing someone sinning, wept bitterly and said: 'He today and I, surely, tomorrow.'"

18 This excerpt seeks to discourage the fancy "dressing" of a monk's worship in his cell. Bowing in worship (*proskynema*) was a deep, ritualistic bow with the bending of the knees made as a gesture of adoration to God and before sacred images. It is the unwarranted elaboration of this ritual which this account decries.

19 The cowl (*koukoulion*) was early adopted as the peculiar garb of a monk. It derives its name from its similarity to a kind of bag in which grocers sold their wares. From the simple cowl, originally a covering for the head, was developed the cloak with a hood which the Benedictines, Cistercians, and other monastic orders still use. See J. Wilpert, *Die Gewandung der Christen in den ersten Jahrhunderten* (Cologne, 1898), pp. 13, 45; and J. Braun, *Die liturgische Gewandung im Occident und Orient nach Ursprung und Symbolik* (Freiburg, 1907), pp. 240, 348.

20 This brief account is devoted to the ascetic ideal of poverty (*aktemosyne*) which the monks founded upon such biblical authority as Luke 5:11, John 6:27, and Luke 10:38 f. Earthly possessions were thought to be sources of temptation and of worldly concern. That the attitude of the ascetics toward the acquisition of property and money varied both according to the historical period of anchoretism and to the personal views of certain groups of monks as prescribed by their ideals and exigencies has been demonstrated by Reitzenstein, *Hist. Mon.*, p. 63, note 5. The early Christians who renounced the world and assumed the ascetic life renounced

77v7. If thou art loath to get up in the night for thy worship, do not give his [Christ's] food to thy body, for the Scripture says, 'Let not the lazy man eat.' For I say to thee that just as men charge the person who steals with a great crime, so does God impute a crime upon every one who does not rise in his worship, unless his failure to rise is due to illness or great fatigue. But even from one who is ill and fatigued God demands a spiritual worship, for such a one, even apart from the body, can approach God.

77v16. If someone brings thee a gift of charity and thou knowest that he is poor, give him much more than he brought. If thou art not able to do this, humbly bow and say: "Pardon me for the Lord's sake, brother, for I am poor; but God will give thee thy reward."

77v26. If thou committest sins of the body, do not consider how thou camest to do them, since thy soul will be defiled if thou dost; but pray, saying, 'Lord, thou knowest my sins. If thou wilt, blot them out, for I do not dare to reflect upon them.'

78v3. If thou visitest a monk, and a prayer is made, and he permits thee to sit down, say to him: "Father, tell me a word of life, how I may find God; and pray for me, for I have many sins." Except for this, do not say another word, unless thou art questioned.[21]

all worldly possessions. They relied upon the bounty and sympathetic aid of fellow Christians for their small needs. As the anchoretic movement found more followers, such a way of life was possible only for wandering, mendicant monks. The ideal of poverty continued in principle among those monks who established their abodes in coenobia, or communities, and undertook some form of profitable labor. Cassianus, *Collatio,* xix, "De fine coenobitae et eremitae, 9 (Migne, *P.L.,* XLIX), pointed out that an anchorite could in no way live up to the ideal of poverty, for he needed money for his own subsistence and for the poor. By including the duty of almsgiving he called upon biblical authority in support of his view. The ideal of poverty is often coupled with that of silence. Both were necessary to make possible the contemplative life of a monk. Reitzenstein, *Hist. Mon., loc. cit.,* has pointed to the parallel of the wandering Cynics and the priests of Cybele in pagan times. Thomas of Margâ, as if to place the stamp of great antiquity upon the ascetic practices of the monks of his day, also refers to certain ancients as forerunners of a life of poverty and solitude. He mentions specifically Pythagoras, Homer, Plato, and Hippocrates, but many of his statements concerning them have no basis in fact. Homer is represented as an alchemist who could transmute metals. Plato, we are to believe, built himself a cell in the heart of the desert and, taking the Old Testament with him, meditated for three years upon the verse "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is One." Hippocrates by means of a life of solitude and silence learned medical lore. Pythagoras advocated restraint of the body and silence as necessary prerequisites for the attainment of spiritual truth. That celibacy and abstinence from animal foods were preached by him is well known. See E. A. Wallis Budge, *The Book of Governors* (London, 1893), II, p. 530.

21 To some ascetics the visits of fellow monks were unwelcome on the ground that they interfered with their program of devotion to God. Complete silence was deemed the best insurance against such pitfalls as lying, cursing, vain chattering, passing judgment, etc. More frequently, however, the apophthegmata presuppose the practice of visitations by monks to fathers

78v6. If a brother tells thee a secret and another binds thee by an oath to tell him the matter, do not reveal the brother's secret; and do not fear the oath which the other imposed upon thee, for the punishment for imposing the oath is upon his own head.

78v10. If the necessities of thy body are lacking, do not tell a man to give thee aught, but rather cast thy care upon the Lord, and he will keep thee, for he who forsakes God and seeks aid from men does not believe that God is able to care for him.

78v13. If a man of his own accord gives thee charity, and thou art in need, take it. But if thou art not in need, accept nothing whatever, for Satan is quick to tempt thee to accept what thou hast no need for.

78v19. Accustom thine eyes not to look upon another's body; if possible, not even upon thine own.

78v24. If thy soul wars upon thee to eat many foods, confine it even to mere bread that it may ask to get its fill even of bread.[22]

78v26. If thou questionest the fathers, and thou hearest the word of God from them and from the Scripture, be zealous to do whatever thou hearest. And if for a time thou becomest negligent and dost not work, do not on this account stop asking questions. For he who asks questions and hears, and fails to give heed, if indeed he censures himself and humbles himself, finds even from this a little mercy. But he who does not ask questions neither hears nor fails to give

with the purpose of securing advice and edification either by posing specific questions on spiritual matters or by making a general plea for an inspirational "word" or "apophthegma." The fathers responded briefly. No sermons were preached, and no father spoke unless requested to do so. The conduct of a visiting monk, as well as the purpose of his visit, are neatly described in this account. Visiting for social reasons is nowhere admitted. In the stereotyped request for a "word" lies the origin of the true apophthegmata. The young learned by associating with the fathers and by heeding their utterances as if inspired by God. The recognition of the wisdom and authority of their responses finds testimony in the fact that so many were put into writing and preserved. Cf. Reitzenstein, *Hist. Mon.*, p. 190, and note 3.

22 The subject of food is frequently touched upon in the apophthegmata. Meat is usually a prohibited food and appears even to have been unknown to some ascetics. The prescribed food for the monks in Scete was bread—especially the unleavened biscuits called *paxamades*—salt, and water. Some vegetables, usually eaten raw, were acceptable. Excessive eating, like excessive drinking and sleeping, were said to cause bad dreams and fornication and to drive away contrition. "Grief and tears are good food for a monk," MS. 77r10. Macarius of Alexandria was so abstemious that not even the hairs of his beard would grow (Palladius, *Hist. Laus.*, II, xviii). Record-breaking abstinence from food, however, was decried on the ground that it led to arrogance (Zeno, 8). Some champions of dietary asceticism are listed with references in O. Zöckler, *Aszese und Mönchtum* (Frankfurt, 1897), I, 237. See also below, MS. 91v4.

heed nor humbles himself nor finds mercy; for as a sick man whose stomach is afflicted becomes nauseated when many foods are given him, but afterwards finds one food which agrees with him and which he can eat and still remain in health, so also is the slothful soul, though it often hears, heedless, but in time it feels altogether ashamed, and probably finds one thing which is pleasing, and does it, and finds salvation by it.

79r29. As soon as thou hast risen from thy sleep, immediately with thy first word let thy mouth glorify God, and begin to sing a hymn in honor of God and to recite psalms; for whatever thought the mind seizes upon the very first thing in the morning, as a millstone it grinds all day, be it wheat or tares. For this reason always take the lead, and sow wheat before the enemy sows tares.

79v3. If thou seest a vision of women in thy sleep, strive not to meditate upon it during the day, for they are death and destruction to the soul. While reclining in thy bed, be mindful of thy death, and say, 'Am I going to rise on the morrow or not?' And pray earnestly before thou sleepest, and both while standing and while reclining see to it that thou never hast an unclean thought, and do not think at all of a woman, even if she is a saint; but rather fall asleep in the midst of thy prayers. For whatever a man thinks of, this same thing he does in the night, whether it be good or bad, for all things are directed to the same end in his bed, for a thought of women abides with him in his bed.[23]

There are angels who adhere firmly to the monk and who are appointed for this very thing—to watch over him. Whenever, night or day, thy heart says to thee, 'Rise up and pray!' know that it is the very angel who abides by thee who is saying to thee, 'Rise up and pray!' And when thou art risen, this angel himself stands by thy side and prays with thee, driving from thee the demons who gnash their teeth against thee. But if thou disobeyest him and art loath to get up, then even he retires from thee, and it is at such a time that thou fallest into the hands of thine enemies.

23 The last few words are apparently a gloss. For the curious temptations which befall monks in their sleep see Cassianus, *Collatio,* xxii, "De nocturnis illusionibus" (Migne, *P.L.,* XLIX). Although the temptation to fornication is often mentioned in the apophthegmata, the relation of the ascetics toward members of the feminine sex is less frequently alluded to. The reason for this lies in the fact that the danger involved in the presence of women was almost completely avoided by the very anchoretism of the monks. The rule in regard to women was so strict as to bar even the closest female kin from their presence. For such monks as went to the city from time to time to sell their wares, contact with women was unavoidable. The subject is dealt with in MS. 98r30, a translation of which I offer. "A brother questioned a monk, saying: 'If it becomes a necessity that one come into association with a woman, how ought he approach her?' And the monk said: 'This necessity is of the Devil, for the Devil holds forth many pretexts as necessities. But if it does become necessary to come into association with a woman, do not permit her to speak excessively. And as for thee, if thou speakest, speak briefly, and take thy leave of her. If thou tarry with her, believe me, her ill smell will take away thy reason.'"

79v21. If thou art fond of a boy or a young man, and people are offended because of thy love, sever thyself from him, even if he is dear to thee as the pupil of thine eye, and stand firm and keep thyself in this determination.

80r12.[24] For if thou dost not have confidence in anyone to tell him of thy temptations, this is an indication that thou dost not possess humility; for the humble man regards everyone as holy and good, but looks upon himself alone as a sinner. But if one calls upon God with all one's heart and goes off and questions a man about one's thoughts, the man (rather God, who opened the mouth of the ass in the presence of Balaam, through the agency of this man, however unworthy and sinful he may be) will say what is best.

80r23. If thou art weighed down for a time by foods, give thyself over to bodily toil in order that before nightfall thou mayest be eased of them and that thou mayest not have bad dreams. Become, as it were, a good contender against the Devil; and if he strike thee on one side, do thou also strike him on the other. If he prevail over thee through foods, do thou prevail over him through wakefulness; and if he make thee heavy with sleep, do thou crush him with bodily labor. If he mislead thee into vainglory, do something or make some gesture in the presence of men that they may dishonor thee.[25] For know this, that Satan is afflicted by nothing so much as by a man who longs for humility and dishonor among men.

80v10. If thou goest to question fathers about thy thoughts, pray first to God, and say, 'Lord, if thou commandest aught, put thy command into the mouth

24 This account is given in our MS. as a continuation of its immediate forerunner and apparently does not appear in other MSS. It may be a later addition designed to illustrate further the purport of what precedes, or an entirely different apophthegmata which, because its theme corresponded so closely with that of the other, was connected with it by the compiler of this collection. I give, in English, the account to which our text has been added. "If unclean thoughts trouble thee, do not keep them secret, but immediately tell them to thy spiritual father and renounce them; for by as much as a man conceals his thoughts, by so much do they multiply and acquire power. As a serpent, if it comes out of its hole, flees, so also is the unclean thought, when it is brought to light, immediately destroyed; and as a worm in wood destroys the wood, so an unclean thought destroys the heart. He who reveals his thoughts is quickly cured, but he who keeps them hidden is afflicted with arrogance."

25 The feigning of idiocy among the monks was based on their interpretation of such biblical authority as I Cor. 1:21 f., 3:18, 4:10. Humility and self-abasement were the watchwords of the desert monks, and their extreme manifestation was playing the fool. In this practice the monk subjected himself to the taunts and vilification of men and imposed upon himself a particularly difficult ascetic labor. This radical form of the expression of humility was comparatively rare, but the theory and practice have persisted even to modern times. For other examples, see MS. 87r4, 100r10, 105r10, Ammona 9, Moses 8, Or 14, and Palladius, *Hist. Laus.*, xxxiv (Butler). The whole subject is treated by Stephen Hilpisch in "Die Torheit um Christi willen," *Zeitschrift für Aszese und Mystik,* VI (1931), pp. 121-131.

of the monk that he may tell me; for I hear his response, O Lord, as if it cometh from thy mouth. Confirm him, Lord, in thy truth that I may hear thy will through him.' And so, what the father tells thee, this observe with firmness and fear.[26]

80v15. If thou fallest into a sin, and thou turnest away from it and beginnest to grieve and repent, see thou do not leave off grieving and groaning to the Lord till the day of thy death, since, if thou dost, thou wilt quickly fall back into the pit itself; for "the godly sorrow" is a bridle of the soul which does not permit it to fall.[27]

89v29. The monks said about another brother that he never left his handiwork, and his prayer ceaselessly went up to God; and he was also exceedingly humble and self-possessed.

91r22. A monk said: "Even as nothing green comes up on a traveled road, not even if thou cast seed, because the place is trodden on, so also among us, remain calm through every matter and thou wilt see things grow which thou didst not know thou hadst within thee, since thou wast always treading on them."

91r26. One of the holy men said: "It is impossible for man, in so far as he enjoys the sweetness of the world, to enjoy the sweetness of God. On the other hand, if he tastes of the sweetness of God, he will hate everything of this life, even as it is recorded in the Gospels, 'No man can serve two masters.' And we, in so far as we desire the way of men and the ease of the body, cannot partake of the sweetness of God. But this I say: 'If one sits in his cell and practices silence and prayer and does his work conscientiously, one can, under these circumstances, be saved.'

91v3. A monk said: "A monk who drinks more than three cups of wine shall not pray for me."[28]

26 We find in this account the basis for the authority which was ascribed to the fathers and their utterances. See note 21, above.

27 The "godly sorrow" which "worketh repentance to salvation" (II Cor. 7:10) is a natural consequence of the fixed conception of man's sinful nature. It is manifested not only in constant self-examination and self-reproach, but also in the adoption of a joyless mode of life and in actual weeping and groaning. Fundamentally the whole ascetic practice of the monks may be looked upon as an act of atonement, and sorrow and weeping were its natural complements. "Weep, for there is no other way," we read in Poemen 119. Some ascetics were famed for their incessant shedding of tears, and their ability to continue them uninterrupted was regarded as a very desirable dispensation of God. See MS. 73r16, 100v13, 100r19, 101v14, Arsenius 41, Macarius of Egypt 41, Peter 2 ("sorrow is a complete course of instruction"), John Moschus, *Pratum Spirituale* (Migne, *P.G.*, LXXXVII), 30, 41, 50, 59, 140.

28 Though the drinking of wine is wholly proscribed in some apophthegmata (MS. 91v4, Poemen 19), its moderate use is condoned in others. Macarius (10) made it a rule that for each goblet of wine he drank he denied himself water for a whole day. In MS. 80v1 we read that "wine and women alienate the young from God." See also MS. 76v21.

91v4. A brother questioned a monk, saying: "What effect has it upon man if he conducts himself indifferently and eats and drinks?" The monk answered: "These things bring about every evil, for we see that the complete devastation of Jerusalem took place through Nebusaradan, the captain-of-the-guard.[29] Then, too, the Lord exhorted his disciples, saying, 'Take heed lest your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting, and drunkenness, and cares of this life.' "

91v9. They said about a certain holy man that he bore witness to his faith in persecution[30] and was much tortured, so that he was even made to sit down upon a heated brazen chair. Just at this time blessed Constantine became king, and the Christians were set free. This holy man, having been healed, returned to his cell; and when he saw it from afar, he said: "Woe is me, for I am again coming into many evils." This he said on account of the struggles and wrestlings against the demons.

91v24. One of the fathers said: "Nothing is better than this commandment, not to despise any of the brothers; for it is written, 'Thou shalt rebuke thy neighbor and not bear sin because of him.' If, then, thou seest that thy brother is sinning and thou dost not speak to him in order that he may in time come to know his own error, his blood will be exacted from thy hands. But if he is rebuked and he persists in his sin, he will die. It is good, therefore, that thou rebuke with love and do not abuse or despise him as an enemy."

92r19. St. Gregory the Theologian[31] said: "How shall we descend to the saving humility without having left behind the ruinous haughtiness of pride if we continually practice such a thing and go to extremes in it as though we are not being harmed on account of this? We cannot do this, for the soul likens itself to its practices and derives its stamp and appearance from the things it does. Let, then, thy appearance and dress, thy gait and seat, thy food and circumstances, thy bed's array, thy dwelling and all the equipment in thy dwelling be characterized by frugality; and further, thy psalm and song and thy conduct toward thy neighbor—let also these things look toward moderation rather than toward haughtiness. Away with labors in sophistic arguments and excessive

29 The reference is to Nebuchadrezzar's captain of the guard (chief-cook) who led the siege of Jerusalem (II Kings 25:8 f.; Jer. 39:9 f., 40:1 f., 41, 10, 52:12-30). Nebusaradan is related to the sin of gluttony and its evil consequences also in Poemen 16.

30 See note 37.

31 Gregory Nazianzen was known as "the theologian" because of his erudition in sacred literature. He not only wrote about anchorites, but also took up his abode with Basil the Great in the desert near the river Iris in Pontus. His stay there was not long. After holding the offices of bishop and archbishop in Nazianzus and Constantinople, he lived in solitude in Nazianzus where, in 389, after some years of a most ascetic life, he died.

sweetness of voice in songs! Do not indulge in dialectic and be offensive, but in all things endure the displays of haughtiness. Be kind toward thy friend, gentle toward a suppliant, forbearing to the presumptuous, charitable to the humble, comforting the oppressed, caring for those in travail, neglecting none at all, pleasant in address, cheery in answer, readily accessible in all things."

98r8. When brothers are present, do not open thy heart. At such a time rather pray in secret, for it is then that there is fear of slander.

98v21. He asked: "How can a man know that his prayer is acceptable?" He answered: "Whenever a man guards against injuring his neighbor, then he is reasonably sure that his prayer has been accepted by God. But if one injures his neighbor, his prayer is abominable and unacceptable, for the groan of the injured party will in no wise permit the prayer of him who has done the injury to approach the presence of God."[32]

100r10.[33] Now men set snares there and caught antelopes, and the monk, too, was caught. And his reasoning said to him, 'Put forth thy hand and release thyself.' But he said to his reasoning, 'If thou art a man, release thyself and go to men. But if thou art an antelope, thou hast no hands.' And he stayed in the snare until morning. When the men came to catch the antelopes and saw the monk ensnared, they were struck with fear. He himself said nothing, and they released him and let him go. And he went off, running behind the antelopes into the wilderness.

102r9. Father Daniel of Scete said to the brothers who had come with him: "If ye wish to be saved, seek after poverty and silence, for the whole life of the monk depends upon these two virtues."

32 The fact that this account lacks any of the more or less stereotyped introductions suggests that an attempt was made to treat it as a continuation of the preceding account. Its subject matter, however, has no direct connection with what precedes.

33 Our MS. here offers an extension of the story of the anchorite and the antelopes published by Nau in *Revue de l'Orient Chretien,* X (1905), pp. 414-415, and based on the Codex Coislinianus 126. This extension seems to be peculiar to our MS. I give in English translation the account which our MS. enlarges upon. "There was a certain anchorite who fed in the wilderness with the antelopes, and he prayed to God, saying: 'Lord, if I fall short in anything, teach me.' And a voice came to him saying: 'Go into the coenobium and do whatever they bid thee do.' And he entered into the coenobium and lived there. He was not familiar with the ministry of the brothers, and the young monks began to teach him the work, saying: 'Do this, idiot, and do this, foolish old man!' Oppressed, he began to say to the Lord: 'I do not understand the work of men. Release me again to the antelopes!' When God had released him, he returned to the country to feed again with the antelopes." The anchorite was apparently assuming that extreme form of self-abasement which a monk sometimes undertook by feigning idiocy. See above, note 25.

102v15. Again there was another ambassador[34] of a large coenobium, and while negotiating for his coenobium he happened to fall into the mire of licentiousness. It came about, then, that he died, and his face became black like soot from a cooking pot. The father of the monastery, who was endowed with the graces of the spirit, when he saw what had happened, gathered together all the brotherhood and said: "This brother has withdrawn from life, and ye know that for our rest and peace he labored wholeheartedly in the negotiations and was, in the manner of a man, tripped up by the Evil One. Since he incurred sins because of us, come, let us work zealously on his behalf and call upon benevolent God to have compassion on him, for God's mercies extend over all his works."

Accordingly, they began with tears to beseech God to have compassion on him, and they all did so three days and three nights without food, eating nothing, but bewailing and lamenting the downfall of the brother. And the abbot of the monastery fell into a trance, and he beheld[35] the Saviour having compassion on the labor of the brothers. But the Devil began to renounce him and to say: "Master, I beseech thee, this man is mine. He is one of our works; I helped to make him fall into sin, O Lord, thou who art a righteous judge and judgest aright." Then the Saviour answered, saying: "I am a righteous judge, to be sure, but also a merciful one, and my mercy and love of man reach beyond justice. And since I am merciful and humane, it is reasonable that I should not disregard an entreaty of so many holy men directed to me on behalf of one who has been wounded, especially when he fell into sin on account of those very ones who invoke me. For this man, too, could have remained in peace like the rest in the monastery and could have been preserved unwounded from the darts of sin, but he stumbled in the manner of a man because he was negotiating for

34 *Apocrisarius* was the title given to a legate or ambassador of the ancient church who negotiated in ecclesiastical matters. The term is here applied to a similar administrator in the smaller sphere of a coenobium. The word "another" in the text is due to the fact that in the preceding account a monk is mentioned who had similar duties, though in a more circumscribed sphere. He ministered unto (*diekonei*) the needs of his three fellow monks. He is there called *diakonetes*. That the titles diaconus and apocrisarius were used for the same office in the Roman church has been pointed out by E. Friedberg, *s.v. apocrisarius,* in the *Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche.*

35 There is no way of telling which of the visions described in the apophthegmata are meant to be true reports and which represent a literary device for the presentation of certain religious ideas or precepts. Some monks in the desert were evidently disposed, by reason of their mode of life, their nature, and their intense concentration upon some religious idea, to fall into a state of ecstasy and claimed because of their experience a special revelation from God. The great majority of the anchorites claimed no insight into heavenly mysteries and even regarded such claims on the part of others with great suspicion. See Reitzenstein's note on Zacharias 4, *Hist. Mon.*, p. 129, note 2; also Olympius 1. That supernatural visions described in the apophthegmata represented at least in part a literary device is suggested by the fact that some are set forth in forms which, with some modifications, appear to be stereotyped. Compare, for example, this account with that immediately following. On the nature of visionary revelations, see the examples cited by Heussi, *Ursprung,* pp. 178-182, and my note 11, *ad fin.*

his brothers. Surely thou dost not see how all have given themselves unto death for him, and how all die for the one. But, nevertheless, persuade them to desist from calling upon me, and do thou take him. Behold, so many souls risk death by hunger, calling upon me for three days and three nights and beseeching with tears on his behalf, not desisting from their prayers made with groans and genuflexions and with the ashes with which they besprinkle their own heads—so great a company calls upon me. And further, since the brother fell into sin, not as one who contemplates the practice of apostasy, but as a man who has fallen into sin by forcible seizure, is it not reasonable that they should obtain the object of their request? Surely, among the earthly kings, if an entire city sees a condemned man being led off to execution, the request of the multitude recalls the royal decree and snatches the accused man from the hands of the executioner. How much more shall I, who am truly a just and humane king, grant my soldiers the request and earnest prayer which they address to me on behalf of this one man?"

When the Lord had said these things, the Devil was confounded, and he disappeared. When the abbot of the monastery recovered from his trance, he related everything to his brothers, and they rejoiced exceedingly. And the face of the brother began little by little to be cleansed of its blackness and became wholly clean. And fully assured that God had placed his soul in the heritage of life, they took up his remains and buried him. They rejoiced exceedingly at the strange salvation of the brother which had taken place, for 'the Lord is nigh unto all them that call upon him in truth.'

103r28. Blessed Paul the Simple related: "I had a disciple, and he incurred various sins without my knowledge. Now, it happened that he died, and I beseeched God zealously and implored the holy Mother of God that I might be shown in what circumstances he was after his departure. When I had persevered in prayer many days, I fell into a trance, and I saw my disciple being supported by two persons, and he had become altogether [hardened like] an earthen vessel from head to foot, without any spiritual or corporeal energy, nor yet speaking at all, but as one who had become petrified. But I, being extremely pained and having become as if inspired, recalled to mind the saying of the Lord, who said, 'The man who has not put on a wedding garment, do ye bind him hand and foot, and cast him out into the outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.' His being bound hand and foot suggests nothing else to us than the fact that every thought and base desire which has not proceeded according to the will of God in this life is repressed and remains inefficacious.

"But when," he said, "I had come out of the trance, I began to be exceedingly distressed and to despair, and I began to bestow alms and to make oblations for him to the best of my ability, and to call upon the very holy

Mother of God to have compassion on him, and to call upon benevolent God on his behalf. Further, I began to assume the labor of abstinence and to eat dry food,[36] even though I had already reached so great an age.

"Then, after some days, I saw the all-holy Mother of God as she said to me, 'Why art thou grieved and distressed, father?' And I said, 'On account of my brother, my Lady, for I saw him in evil plight.' And she answered and said, 'Didst thou not entreat me out of a desire to see him? And lo, thou wast satisfied.' And I said, 'Yes, prithee, my Lady, I did call upon thee, but I did not wish to see him thus weeping and suffering.' And the holy Mother of God said to me, 'Go; on account of thy suffering, humility, and love I will show him to thee that thou mayest not be grieved.' And on the following day I again saw the brother, now coming toward me in great joy, walking by himself and talking. And he said to me, 'Thy entreaties, father, prevailed upon the all-holy Mother of God because she loves thee exceedingly, and she called upon the Saviour, and he loosed me from my bonds, for I was bound up with the bonds of my sins.'

"When the brother had said these things, I was filled with joy, and immediately I saw the holy Mother of God, and she said to me, 'Hast thou at length attained satisfaction, elder?' I said, 'Yes, my Lady, and I was exceedingly glad to see that he was in a state of tranquility.' And she said to me, 'Depart, then, and always be mindful of thy brother in prayers, almsgiving, and oblations, for almsgiving, even just oblations, especially obtain mercy for him who has died.'"

104r2. Father Athanasius, the bishop of Alexandria, said: "Often one of us says, 'Where is the persecution for bearing witness?'[37] Bear witness unto

36 The Montanists introduced xerophagia as a special form of fasting for the period immediately preceding Easter. The dry-food diet excluded fatty and dainty foods and admitted only such simple fare as bread, salt, dried fruit and, despite the actual meaning of the word employed, honey and water. Cf. Suicer, *Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus, s.v. xerophageo.*

37 This passage suggests the words in the *Vita Antonii* (*P.G.*, XXVI), § 47, line 4, where it is said of Anthony that he had sought in vain for martyrdom, and when the persecutions ended, he returned to his monastery and there each day gave witness. The complaint implied in the question at the beginning of our account had great significance, for the cessation of the persecutions of the Christians in the fourth century deprived the enthusiasm for martyrdom of its means of satisfaction. A substitute for this martyrdom was created in the stricter ascetic acts of all sorts which some monks undertook. The idea that the ascetic life of a monk is a daily martyrdom was expressed by several ancients. Cf. Reitzenstein, *Hist. Mon.*, pp. 87-90; and E. Lucius, *Die Anfänge des Heiligenkults in der christlichen Kirche* (Tübingen, 1904), pp. 396-399. On real and self-imposed persecution in the early church, see Karl Holl, "Die Vorstellung vom Märtyrer und die Märtyrerakte in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung," *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum* (Geschichte und deutsche Lit.), XVII (1914), pp. 521-556; F. Kattenbusch, "Der Märtyrertitel," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums,* IV (1903), pp. 111-127; Bonwetsch, "Märtyrer und Bekenner," *Realencykl. für prot. Theologie und Kirche,* XII (1902), pp. 48 f.; and Joh. Geffcken, "Die christlichen Märtyrien," *Hermes,* XLV (1910), pp. 481-505.

thy conscience, 'be dead unto sin,' 'mortify thy members which are upon the earth,' and thou hast become a witness unto thy principle. The martyrs of old contended against kings and princes. Thou also hast a king as adversary, even the Devil, the king of sin, and princes, too, in the demons. For thus in those days, too, there were placed before them a pagan altar and a censer and an abomination of idolatry, a reprehensible idol, perceptible in the soul. The greediness of gluttony is a pagan altar; the desire for pleasures is a censer; and the spirit of desire is an idol. For he who is enslaved to fornication and has time for pleasures denies Jesus and worships an image, for he has in himself the image of Aphrodite, the shameful pleasure of the flesh. Again, if one is worsted by anger and wrath and fails to throw off the folly of his passion, he denies Jesus and has in himself Ares as his god, for he submits to wrath, which is an idol of folly. Another, being avaricious and pleasure-loving, by closing his heart against his brother and not showing mercy unto his neighbor, denies Jesus and worships idols, for he has in himself the idol of Hermes, and, besides, he worships 'the creature rather than the Creator,' 'for the root of all evil is the love of money.' Consequently, if thou refrain from these things and guard against the mad passions, thou treadst upon thy idols and denyest superstition, and thou becomest 'a confessor of the good confession.' "[38]

38 Cf. Col. 3:5, where, too, we find that fornication, covetousness, etc., are likened to idolatry.

Book Reviews and Notices[1]

The Library of Christian Classics. Vol. IV: Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesius of Emesa. Edited by William Telfer. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1955. 466 pages. $5.00.

The selections included in this volume date from the fourth century and come from the pens of Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, and Nemesius, bishop of Emesa, a Syrian city of some importance in that period. Cyril's *Catechetical Lectures* were delivered in the year A.D. 350, and Nemesius apparently wrote his *Treatise on the Nature of Man* in the last decade of the same century.

In the early Christian centuries the season of Lent was used for the instruction and preparation of catechumens for baptism on Easter eve. Cyril's lectures were delivered for this purpose. Consequently they are a rich source of information about the early church. They reflect the tenor of Christian teaching in the fourth century in a particularly revealing way since Cyril's purpose was instructive and practical rather than polemical. As Cyril sets forth the fundamentals of the faith for inquiring laymen, the twentieth century reader is given a real insight into the doctrinal atmosphere of the age in which he lived, although he seems to ignore the famous Arian Controversy which agitated the church during much of the fourth century.

Cyril's *Catechetical Lectures,* which are not reproduced in their entirety in this volume inasmuch as only twelve of the original nineteen are represented, reveal that the Jerusalem church possessed a venerable teaching tradition and that the adequacy of its catechetical instruction was one of its chief glories.

The name of Nemesius is not nearly so well known as that of Cyril. In fact, scholars are unable to identify him with absolute certainty. It has been the fate of his *Treatise on the Nature of Man* "to suffer alternations of oblivion and rediscovery," although leading theologians of the past have been familiar with it. The author manifests considerable familiarity with classical pagan authors and a remarkable mastery of the medical knowledge of his day. His basic interest is in ethics, but he also writes with an apologetic motivation. In the words of the editor, the treatise of Nemesius "is liberal in spirit, and ready to follow scientific enquiry to its proper goal, to a degree that renders it surprisingly modern" (p. 223).

The editor has provided competent introductory articles and unusually helpful footnotes.

EUGENE L. FEVOLD

Luther: Letters of Spiritual Counsel. Edited and translated by Theodore G. Tappert. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1955. $5.00.

A well-worn story tells of the door over which was the superscription "The Kingdom of Heaven" and another door where a sign hung, "Lecture tonight on the Kingdom of Heaven." The latter entrance was crowded, while the other was without customers. This same situation has obtained in America until quite recently on the subject of Martin Luther. There has been no dearth of discussions *about* Luther, but there were few who beat a path to Luther himself. Partly, that was because Luther was largely available only to the student who could read German and Latin. That situation is rapidly being corrected.

In these *Letters of Spiritual Counsel* a judicious and far-ranging sampling of Luther's voluminous correspondence is made available to the English reader. Those who know Luther only as the tortured monk, wrestling for spiritual certainty, or the embattled knight of faith standing in his splendid isolation at Worms, or the professor of theology at Wittenberg will find here another Luther.

1 Books reviewed or noticed in these pages may be purchased through your church's publication house.

This is Luther the *Seelsorger,* the spiritual counselor of a host of anxious and troubled people.

Here you will find a real classic, Luther's open letter to his friend Master Peter the Barber, who had written to ask for advice on how to keep his thoughts from wandering when he prayed, and how to pray better. The letter, still as fresh and pertinent as it was four hundred years ago, is alone worth the price of the book.

Here, too, are letters bringing comfort to the sick and dying, and consolation for the bereaved. The anxious hearted did not turn to Luther in vain; the persecuted found encouragement to steadfastness in the hour of trial.

The pastor who is interested in counseling will discover that Luther also engaged in long-distance counseling on questions of sex and marriage and many other problems that clergymen face today.

The editor has wisely included selections from Luther's Table Talk, which though not strictly in the category of letters, contain the stuff of which good letters are composed—namely, good conversation. Luther was a ready talker, and the students and visitors at his hospitable table knew how to draw him out on just about every subject from Aaron to Zwingli.

Dr. Tappert has provided an excellent introduction to the collection. Brief comments furnish the necessary background for intelligent reading of the letters, and ample footnotes elucidate without becoming ponderous. This book will not add to your knowledge about Luther. Rather it will make you feel that you are meeting the man himself. Every pastor will be a better pastor for reading this book.

JOHN W. RILLING

The Complete Writings of Menno Simons. Translated from the Dutch by Leonard Verduin and edited by John Christian Wenger, with a biography by Harold S. Bender. Scottdale, Pennsylvania: Herald Press, 1956. 1,092 pages. $8.75.

Present-day interest in the Reformation has resulted in not a few new editions of the works of the Reformers and a considerable library about them and their work. This edition of the writings of Menno Simons, the first complete one in English, becomes a part of that collection.

There are three types of material in this book. The major portion of course contains the writings of Simons which are arranged chronologically. Then there is a helpful note of introduction preceding each of the treatises, giving the reader his orientation as to the situation out of which the writing came. Finally, but first in the book, there is a thirty-page biography of Simons which seeks to point out the highlights of Simons' life and career. The biography and introductory notes are done in sympathetic spirit by those who agree with the basic principles for which Simons fought and concerning which he wrote.

Simons, a contemporary of Luther, had much in common with the great Reformer. Born in 1496, Simons became a priest in the Roman Church, experienced doubts concerning the validity of the church's exclusive claims, was nauseated by the dissolute life led by many fellow priests, discovered the Bible, and finally in it the truths which set him "free." He was acquainted with some of Luther's writings and at the time of his "conversion" (1535-36) was influenced by the Anabaptist movement already active in Holland. The result was the Menno Simons who became a crusading Protestant opposed almost as violently to the Lutheran practice of infant baptism as he was to the abuses which he found in the Roman Church.

His biographer says "he built no system of theology, nor did he discover any great new or long-lost principle; he merely caught a clear vision of two fundamental biblical ideals, the ideal of practical holiness and the ideal of the high place of the church in the life of the believer and in the cause of Christ" (p. 29). That ought to be quite enough for any man, if that is really what he did!

The first of Simons' works in this book is *The Blasphemy of John of Leiden.* This piece is a polemic against the leader of a group of Münsterites, radical Protestants who were seeking to establish a theocratic state on the basis of essentially biblical principles. Simons attacks John of Leiden for making himself "king" when there is really

only one "King of kings" according to the Scriptures. John is a blasphemer and a perverter of the truth of the Bible. The issue is that simple! The sweeping completeness of Menno's attack, the deep conviction of the rightness of his own position and the error of John of Leiden, the massive quoting of Scripture to "prove" each accusation, the unwillingness even to entertain for a moment the thought that there might be error in his position, the identifying of his own application of Scripture to a contemporary situation with "the Truth"—these are characteristics which stick out in this first of Menno's writings and which persist in all of them. He must have been a tough man in debate. He and God were always right!

There is not much variety in the subject matter of Simons' writings. He had a few pet themes, among which were the absolute truth for any situation or problem is to be found directly in the Bible, the doctrine of infant baptism and belief in the possibility of infants having faith are to be rejected as unscriptural, Christians are to "shun" all false brethren and false teachers. (In connection with "shunning," Simons had trouble with his followers. They refused to accept his ideas, and Mennonites today reject his practice of "shunning.")

The True Christian Faith (75 pages), *Reply to Gellius Faber* (160 pages), and *Foundation of Christian Doctrine* (124 pages) are the most lengthy and "meaty" of the treatises. They also are the most systematically organized and most faithfully present the distinctive doctrines for which Menno fought. All are polemic in character and almost belligerent in tone. In spite of all the heat, however, there is light. Many of what have come to be the traditional Baptist attacks on the Lutheran position regarding baptism are here set forth with clarity and force. There are present-day attacks on infant baptism which are much more frantic and much less lucid than are the arguments of this man Simons. No doubt the contemporary "antipedobaptists" are some sort of great-great-great-great-grandchildren of Menno, however, because their arguments are his all over again.

Lutherans might as well realize that there are thinkers in the church who just cannot get themselves to believe that the Scriptures teach the possibility of God's working his grace in connection with water. There is some kind of mental block at this point for many devoted students of the Scriptures. In reading a man like Simons on these matters one gets to wondering whether the Lutheran position has been sufficiently differentiated from the purely sacramentarian *ex opere operato* view of Roman Catholicism. To Simons there seemed to be no difference. To many Baptists today there is none. The evangelical principle of *sola gratia* evidently needs some explaining in good small two-syllable words.

Simons' doctrine of man is Arminian, of course. From that starting position he moves on to accept both the direct responsibility of man for his own salvation (man must believe!) and also the perfect grace of God as the only way in which man is saved. (E.g., infants "automatically" receive the benefits of Christ's redemption without faith on their part.) Menno was unconcerned about this and other inconsistencies in his theology. It was enough to say that all is taught clearly in Scripture. This using of Scripture as a refuge from clear thinking is not alone the problem of Menno Simons. It is always sad when men of God naively believe that when they have quoted Scripture they have answered all the questions and silenced every argument. They forget such questions as, "Does Scripture really say that and only that?" "Is this Scripture applicable here?"

If Simons had a fault as a teacher of the Word, it certainly was not his loyalty to it but instead this stubborn insistence that he always understood correctly what Scripture teaches. And you seem to sense in his writing a clinging to the written word which almost replaces a loyalty to the living Christ. The warmth of these writings is found, not in the communication of a radiating personal relationship with Christ, but in their zeal for the cause which Simons sought always to vindicate on the basis of Scripture. Religious controversy tends to do this. It does not mean that a man does not love his Lord. But it may mean that his desire to be the Lord's champion steers the center of his Christian consciousness away from Christ

and into the endless battle of words. In the case of Menno Simons this may be one of the reasons why so many of his followers finally found him to be too severe and legalistic and left him.

While we point this out we must also say that Simons' work certainly placed into the stream of Christian thinking a forceful and strong presentation of the "Anabaptist" position. And we must remind ourselves that there are at least a few pages in this book which are relatively free of the attacking spirit. There are some letters and two hymns, the spirit of which is milder than in the rest of what Simons wrote. The hymns, in true continental Reformation style, have, respectively, eleven stanzas (long ones) and six stanzas (longer ones).

This volume is large, imposing, and nicely bound! It will look fine on a reference shelf even if it gets close to Calvin's *Institutes* and Luther's *Works*.

SIDNEY A. RAND

Puritan Sage. Collected Writings of Jonathan Edwards. Edited by Vergilius Ferm. New York: Library Publishers, 1953. xvii, 640 pages. $7.50.

What finer tribute could be paid on the 250th anniversary of Jonathan Edwards' birth than to make his writings easily available? Thinking people will welcome this access into the mind of one who has been called the greatest, most original thinker America has produced. Those who desire to understand America must come to understand Puritanism and what has happened to it; in this study Edwards occupies a pivotal position. Indirectly this problem is of concern to American Lutherans; important relationships exist between Puritanism and Lutheranism in America which have hardly begun to be explored.

The editor's design apparently is to take the measure of the man. Twenty-seven writings, entire or abridged, chronologically arranged, open up to us the fascinating personality of Edwards, and the astonishing range and penetration of his thought. Here we get an insight into his precocious scientific talent, the rigorous self-disciplining of his mind and spirit, his bold attempt to integrate his theological tradition (Calvinistic-Puritan) with contemporary developments in science (Newton) and philosophy (Locke). Here appears the penetrating theologian who resolutely opposed the tendencies of both liberals and arch-conservatives to domesticate God. Here is the sober preacher who found himself at the center of an amazing revival, the First Great Awakening; who, in order critically to evaluate this phenomenon, then found it necessary to reflect deeply upon the nature of religion and the psychology of Christian experience, and upon his own pastoral responsibilities. Here is the minister who set his Christian preaching and teaching into an ample framework —inquiries into "The Nature of True Virtue," "The End for which God Created the World," and "A History of the Work of Redemption."

Here, in short, is rewarding reading for the thoughtful. The editor's introduction is useful as a sort of annotated index, otherwise not outstanding.

ROBERT H. FISCHER

Sören Kierkegaard. By Finn Jor. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1955. 160 pages.

First published in Norwegian and then translated into Swedish, only the Swedish translation has been available to me. The book is a good introduction to the life and thought of Kierkegaard. It is divided into two parts, a biographical section and a section dealing with the thought of Kierkegaard. An introductory chapter presents the author's point of view and the scope of the book.

The basis for Jor's interpretation is a little book, *The Point of View for my Work as an Author,* written in 1848, and in which Kierkegaard offers an orientation to his own writings. Here Kierkegaard maintains that he was not first an aesthetic writer who became religious when he grew older but, on the contrary, the whole authorship was religious from the very beginning. The little book affirms "what I truly am as an author, that I am and was a religious author, that the whole of my work as an author is related to . . . the problem of becoming a Christian."

Kierkegaard's authorship is directed

against "the monstrous illusion we call Christendom, . . . the illusion that in such a land as ours all are Christians of a sort." The task of a missionary in Christendom is first to arouse interest. Therefore he begins with the aesthetic and moves toward the religious. What is required is a *new strategy,* an *indirect method of communication.* This method is deceptive; it is calculated to deceive people out of their illusion, to lead them away from the aesthetic and immediate mode of life to a Christian mode of life. The pseudonymous authorship was calculated to arouse the interest and to communicate indirectly, and in such a way that the author is not identified with the views of any particular pseudonym. Thus Kierkegaard states: "In the pseudonymous works there is not a single word which is mine. I have no opinion about these works except as third person, no knowledge of their meaning except as a reader, not the remotest private relation to them, since such a thing is impossible in the case of a doubly reflected communication." These are words which preachers ought to ponder before they too readily quote from the works of Kierkegaard. Finn Jor's book gives a brief but fine introduction to the problem of pseudonymity.

In *The Point of View* Kierkegaard speaks of the authorship as his own upbringing and education. When he looks back upon his work, he is astonished at the unity and consistency of the whole, and this he can attribute only to divine governance. Finn Jor quotes from the last words of *The Point of View:* "The dialectical structure which he brought to completion, of which the several parts are whole works, he could not ascribe to any man, least of all would he ascribe it to himself; if he were to ascribe it to any one, it would be to Governance, to whom it was in fact ascribed, day after day and year after year, by the author, who historically died of a mortal disease, but poetically died of longing for eternity."

On the basis of the presentation of *The Point of View* Finn Jor draws the parallel between Kierkegaard's life and thought. Jor's book significantly carries the sub-title, "Det levda livets tänkare" (The thinker of the life which is lived). The biographical part of his book deals with the significance of Providence or Governance in directing the life of Kierkegaard through particular events. The interpretation of his thought follows the plan suggested by Kierkegaard and leads from the aesthetic to what it means to become a Christian. Jor accepts the role of Providence in the life of Kierkegaard. Consequently he is "engaged" or committed to a point of view.

Jor rejects the psychological approach to Kierkegaard, an approach which has occupied itself with the nature and source of Kierkegaard's supposed insanity, and which consequently interprets his writings from this point of view with the result that he is a genius to be admired, but whose thought is dangerous for the normal human being. Jor takes the position that the only correct understanding of Kierkegaard must follow the interpretative directive furnished in *The Point of View.* Such an approach has the advantage that it is in agreement with Kierkegaard's own position, or at least as he understood himself in 1848, but it has the disadvantage of not being adequately objective. Furthermore, it may lead to an oversimplification which does not take cognizance of the development and maturation of Kierkegaard's own thinking.

Finn Jor points out that Kierkegaard affirms that in the development from the aesthetic stage to the ethical stage, and from the ethical stage to the religious and later to the Christian stage, the transition is not a gradual growth in insight or deepening of the human-universal religiosity toward Christianity. The development from one stage to another is not gradual. The transition is not logical or necessary, but a "leap," an inexplicable transition. At the same time Jor asserts that Kierkegaard maintained that one cannot arrive at Christianity (Religiosity B) without first having passed through the human-universal religiosity of immanence (Religiosity A). This gives me occasion to answer his reference to my own position. Jor writes: "Kierkegaard's juxtaposition of Religiosity A and Religiosity B . . . has misled a group of scholars to believe that there is an inner connection between the two forms of religiosity, an inner connection which suspiciously reminds of a gradual development. The American Reidar Thomte is even bold

enough to assert that in the thought of Kierkegaard there is no either/or which separates Religiosity A from Christianity."

The passage in my book to which Jor refers reads as follows: "Christianity, such as Kierkegaard conceived it, does not exist apart from religion A, the religion of immanence. Furthermore, there is no either/or separating religion A from Christianity. . . . Kierkegaard presents only one great choice: *Either* the aesthetic mode of life, whether it be life of pleasure, despair, or religious and metaphysical contemplation, *or* the ethical mode of life comprehended within the religiosity of immanence and culminating in Christianity." From the context it is evident that in this connection I say nothing about the transition from one stage to another. To Kierkegaard every existential transition, whether moral or religious, is pathetic and takes place through a "leap." I fully agree with Jor that there is no logical, necessary, or gradual transition from the religiosity of immanence to Christianity. On the other hand, I maintain that the Christian religious experience as presented by Kierkegaard does not involve a complete annihilation or putting away of the religious experience found within the religion of immanence. It should be kept in mind that Kierkegaard is not dealing with religious doctrines but with religiosity. The position I have presented finds some support in *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* and in the *Papers*. Kierkegaard maintains that the religious sphere includes the ethical, that it is an essential requirement of the religious that it has passed through the ethical, and that the religious sphere lies so close to the ethical that they are in constant communication with one another.

As to the relationship between the religion of immanence and Christianity, the *Postscript* states that religiosity B is discriminative, selective, and polemical. I become blessed only upon a definite condition, and "as I absolutely bind myself to this condition, so do I exclude every other man who does not thus bind himself." Then follow these words, "Every Christian possesses the pathos of Religiosity A, and then this pathos of discrimination." There is something, then, in Religiosity A which is not eliminated in the Christian religiosity. A similar thought is expressed in *The Book about Adler*, where Kierkegaard maintains that all religiosity resides in subjectivity, in inwardness, in being profoundly moved, in being shaken up, in the qualitative pressure upon the subjective. In one place Kierkegaard writes: "To be shaken (pretty much in the sense that one speaks of shaking a person to make him wake up) is the more universal foundation for all religiousness; the experience of being shaken, of being deeply moved, the coming into being of subjectivity in the inwardness of emotion, the pious pagan and the pious Jew have in common with the Christian. Upon this common basis of more universal emotion the qualitative difference must be erected and make itself felt, for the more universal emotion has reference only to something abstract: to be moved by something higher, something eternal, by an idea. And one does not become a Christian by being moved by something indefinitely higher, and not every outpouring of religious emotion is a Christian outpouring." The Christian religious mode is distinct, and yet in such a way that it comprehends the pathos of the religion of immanence.

Kierkegaard is frequently spoken of as the father of existentialism. Jor significantly points out that the term "existence-philosophy" is foreign to Kierkegaard, and that if he had been familiar with the term, he would have repudiated it, for a reflection which has existence as its object is after all just as abstract as the speculative system of Hegel. On the other hand, Kierkegaard is concerned with the existing thinker, the existing person whose task is to live or exist. Jor states that existentialism is essentially anthropological, while Kierkegaard's thought is theological, but in the sense that theology is impossible if it is not actualized in existence. Kierkegaard's thought is existence-theology.

I can heartily recommend Jor's book to all who read Swedish or Norwegian. It is a valuable introduction to Kierkegaard. It is, however, to be regretted that the book furnishes no references to the sources used.

REIDAR THOMTE

The Meaning of the Creative Act. By Nicholas Berdyaev. Translated by Donald A. Lowrie. New York: Harper and Bros., 1955. 344 pages.

This posthumous publication of the famous Russian lay-theologian causes mingled sorrow and joy. The sorrow derives not only from the loss of the late Berdyaev's further productivity but also from the weaknesses which, in honesty, must be identified in this book. The joy arises because the reissue of this book—which first appeared in Russian in 1914—witnesses, although unevenly, to Berdyaev's basic philosophical beliefs. With this book the period of creative Russian Christian theological and philosophical thought probably comes to its close. A few great Russian minds—authors in exile such as Nicoli Lossky—still produce; the end of a significant era and point of view nonetheless is here.

Symbolic is the fact that this book, like that era, deals with creativity and is itself creative. The thesis is that God, the supreme Creator, calls human beings to creative activity which is our creative answer to God's love. Most of the problems revolve around the theme familiar to religious thought the world over, namely, that "man is a creator not only in the name of God, but in the name of the devil as well." With a topic as basic as this, Berdyaev could easily relate creativity to the subject matters of philosophy, asceticism, sex, ethics, aesthetics, mysticism, and what-have-you: and he did, in fourteen chapters. Although not rambling, there is a certain arbitrariness as regards both the chapter-subject relations and the contents of each chaper.

The union of strengths and weaknesses appears at once with assertions that "the creative act is good" (no evidence is given to support the assertion) but with the absence in the first 126 pages (and for no structural reason) of a definition of creativity. It eventually appears that by creation Berdyaev means *ex nihilo,* though he lightly dismisses other conceptions of creativity and fails to analyze and define his own view. He thinks that only *persons* create, that creativity is related to freedom, but that freedom "is a mystery." If creativity is a mystery, as it turns out to be in his hands, scarcely 338 pages were needed to draw that (unsupported) conclusion.

There are two characteristics of Berdyaev's writing in this book—though happily not in many of his other books and essays —which plague him as they plague much theological writing today. One is a liquid verbosity which, *a la Goethe* "klingt wunderlich" but conveys little meaning. Nothing is gained by talking about "anthropodicy," "gnosseology," or "androgynity" which is "the ultimate union of male and female in a higher God-like being" (p. 223) and suggesting if not claiming (as he sometimes does) that problems are being solved. I surely do not wish to become the advocate of the logical positivists, but if I had to choose between them and the theological word-jugglers now operating in the center ring, I would take the positivists every time. What is more important, most of the enlightened and influential minds in the world today, when faced wth *that* choice, are choosing the positivists. The result is almost tragic, but the cause is plain.

The other unfortunate characteristic is a running fight with philosophy, a fight which is unwarranted and intellectually irresponsible. Concerning the former, as Karl Barth (who surely is not prejudiced in favor of philosophy) has repeatedly pointed out, those who oppose philosophical discussion are involved in it in their very opposition, and the philosophical issues will no more down than a log in deep water. So Berdyaev, like many another contemporary, condemns this and damns that but neglects to see that the question still remains: What's your answer and why? His answer, actually, is exceedingly questionable because he really holds—or dangerously flirts with—a thorough-going dualism (see p. 19, passim). Now, Manichaeanism is very old, and one should at least be aware of the difficulties of that position. Berdyaev shows little evidence of this awareness.

But worse, there is here a gross misunderstanding of the scientific method—an unforgivable error in this decade—a naive notion that the "truth of religion revealed" settles epistemological questions—without any recognition of the inevitability of using tests of truth—and many of the standard

fallacies of reasoning such as question-begging (p. 29) and careless dogmatism (pre-existence of souls, p. 120). I spell this out, not to reveal the numerous weaknesses of this book, but to show how unnecessary and reprehensible they are in mature religious discussion today. These are offenses which in religious writers are inexcusable.

One ought not dwell upon other objectionable features, such as the strange, allegedly Christian interpretation of sex which is startlingly unbiblical, but pass on to certain assets. These are chiefly embedded in the text—Hegel-like—and are often very provocative, as when he writes, "All true genius is erotic" (p. 201), and at the same time, "He who begets the most creates the least" (p. 200). He is needle sharp in his assessment of pagan vs. Christian art. Ministers and professional lecturers generally could use his characterization of "the church of Peter," which embodies obedience and adaptation, vs. "the church of John," which embodies creativity, as a text for discussion. His observations on the German and Protestant mentality are wonderful meat for a seminar session in a college or seminary. Or ponder this observation: "The religious center of gravity will be transferred from the clerically-protective to the prophetically-creative" (p. 335). Reading that, one feels like crying to the spirit of Berdyaev, "May it be so!" Alas, he makes a categorical statement, whereas there is as much or more evidence for the contradictory of that judgment.

CHARLES W. KEGLEY

The Church in Soviet Russia. By Matthew Spinka. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956. 179 pages. $3.25.

Likely for most Americans the picture of the organization and status of the Orthodox Church under Soviet rule is vague and confused. Names of persons and places are unfamiliar and unpronounceable. Reports of religious conditions in the USSR are contradictory. Reliable information seems to be difficult for English readers to obtain.

For such conditions this book is a welcome relief. Its aim is to present briefly a history of the top administration of the Russian Orthodox Church since the fall of the Romanov dynasty in 1917. This aim is accomplished clearly and with vigor. In essence this is a study of the relation of church and state in the period indicated. It is a vivid picture of the plight and problems of ecclesiastical officials under political dictatorship.

There are but three chapters, one devoted to each of the three patriarchs. Under Patriarch Tikhon the church met defeat in its struggle for autonomy. Under Patriarch Sergei the church's administration escaped extinction only by capitulation to government control. The thorough elimination of recalcitrant elements in the church, and the predominant loyalty of Orthodox clergy and laity to the Stalin regime during World War II, made possible the government's manifest domination and use of the church under Patriarch Alexei. A brief sketch of the life and an evaluation of the work of each patriarch is given.

There is, of course, no sympathy with Soviet policies in the book. In that respect this study cannot be objective but must express criticism of Orthodox subservience to political programs. The book makes abundantly clear how the church has sacrificed honesty and sincerity by supporting the Soviet official line. Yet the author is frank enough to recognize that Orthodox officials faced the fearful alternatives of either the subservience or the extinction of the church. It has to be recognized that while some hierarchs chose martyrdom, others would be found who would choose submission.

The name, Matthew Spinka, is enough to assure the reader of a work of thorough scholarship and attractive style. As the leading American authority on church affairs behind the Iron Curtain he may be read with confidence. In this instance his conclusion that Russian Orthodox plans to supplant Constantinople with Moscow as chief patriarchate coincide with Soviet expansionist aims is highly significant.

In short, this is an important book, distinctly valuable to all who would understand the Russian church situation.

W. D. ALLBECK

The Story of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. By Benjamin J. Lake. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956. 126 pages. $1.00.

The author states that his purpose is "to give the Presbyterian layman some idea of the history and development of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A." (p. 9). This small book will also be helpful to any non-Presbyterian layman or pastor interested in a brief account of the history of Presbyterianism in America. It is written in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the founding of the first American presbytery and surveys the story of Presbyterianism from the colonial period to the present. The last three of the volume's seven chapters deal primarily with northern Presbyterianism, which since the slavery controversy has been organized as the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. The last chapter, entitled "New Vision for the People, New Life for the Church," reveals that the era since World War II has been one of great activity and growth for the Presbyterians, as it has been for so many other denominations.

EUGENE L. FEVOLD

The Christian Interpretation of Religion. By Edward J. Jurji. New York: Macmillan Company, 1952. 318 pages. $4.50.

The purpose of this thoughtful and enlightening book is indicated by its subtitle: Christianity in Its Human and Creative Relationships with the World's Cultures and Faiths. It is an attempt to "sketch along Christian lines an interpretation of religion in its universal manifestations, . . . an attempt to depict the religions—extinct and living, primitive and advanced—in the light of the Gospel." Jurji affirms that "in the light of the Gospel, a general revelation is manifest, despite many disqualifying features, in almost all the religions of mankind. These religions have failed to conform with the truth already disclosed to them" (20-21). "The greatness of the Hebraic-Christian tradition is intrinsic and patent, making it unique without any necessity to disparage all that there is in the religious systems of the ancient world. Indeed, there is hardly any religion in which relics and surmises of man's converse with God were totally absent" (64). Jurji maintains that "as regards the non-Christian religions, the Gospel summons their adherents to the true meaning of general revelation and its corroboration in the person of Jesus Christ" (35: cf. 20-38). The Gospel is not eclectic but "derives its message from the living, self-revealing God, and proclaims Jesus Christ as Lord Incarnate, a historical Saviour and through his Resurrection an everlasting contemporary" (170). "Whether in Prophet, Gospel, Epistle, or any other part of Holy Writ, the cogency and relevance of the biblical record in relation to the living religions derive from the unique character of Scripture and the divine, redemptive purpose that inspires the whole" (136). Preliminary discussions dealing with the structure of religion, the religions of primitives, and the great religions of antiquity are followed by chapters on Shinto, Hinduism, Confucianism, Taoism, Buddhism, Judaism, and Islam. The concluding chapters are discussions of the making and dynamism of Christianity, and the responsibility of Christianity. "The basic offense of the Gospel is that in presenting a sound diagnosis of man's ailment it does not offer a worldly cure but offers instead what the Eternal has abundantly supplied for the creature's unlimited growth in grace and love. Against this design of sanctification and liberation of the human spirit no earthly expression of defeat, decadence, and pride can prevail" (299). To many who are concerned about the meaning of general revelation and "The Biblical Interpretation of Living Religions" (Chapter VI) this straightforward book will be informative and helpful. It is deserving of a wide reading.

HJALMAR W. JOHNSON

Ethics in Theory and Practice. By Thomas E. Hill. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1956. 431 pages. $4.50.

This is Prof. Hill's second textbook in ethics, the first being *Contemporary Ethical Theories* (New York, 1950). Prof. Hill, who is professor of philosophy at Macalester College, St. Paul, Minnesota, obviously has the student in mind in writing his books,

and this particular text has many virtues that commend it to classroom use. His outline is precise and his writing lucid. What it lacks in liveliness of style, it makes up in clarity, certainly a desirable feature of a work in philosophy.

The first half of the book is given over to a survey of ethical theories. The last half is divided equally between a "working theory" (the meaning of ethical terms and the order of "intrinsic values") and practical ethics (personal and social ethical problems).

Prof. Hill is a patient and orderly writer. This is evident especially in his survey of ethical theories. His procedure is to take up each ethical position in turn, give it by means of a study of a representative thinker a brief and fair exposition, and then submit it to critical evaluation, pro and con. This may have a tendency to become monotonous, but Prof. Hill tries to avoid this by building up a case for the view which he uses in the latter half of the book. Thus he examines in turn several ethical views under three large categories: "approval" theories (emotive, social, reflective, theological), formal theories (Kant, Ross), and teleological theories (Stoicism, evolutionism, human nature theories, specific value theories). He casts his vote for a sub-type of the "specific value" view, namely, a modification of G. E. Moore's theory of the "unique good." He argues that Moore's understanding of "intrinsic good" must always be a conscious experience, but in other respects he agrees with Moore that the concept "good" cannot be defined in terms of any other concept. In working out his theory, Hill discusses carefully the meaning of ethical terms such as "good" or "right," endeavoring thereby to meet head-on the contention of contemporary philosophical analysts who insist on clarification of meanings.

Against any positivistic or relativistic dismissal of ethics as a science, Hill clearly believes in the validity of the use of reason in ethics. Since his is a work in moral philosophy, it does not very often touch the borders of moral theology. At one point, however, it does—namely, an analysis of Emil Brunner's ethics as the most representative of the "theological approval theory." I would not deny the prominence of Brunner's work in theological ethics, but I would deny that it is representative, and it is unfortunate if Prof. Hill gives the impression that by analyzing Brunner he has effectively treated theological ethics. Brunner's approach is quite suspicious of philosophical ethics, and without going into any detail, it is easy for a philosopher or a theologian with a more friendly attitude to philosophy to make Brunner a target of criticism. George Thomas' *Christian Ethics and Moral Philosophy,* for example, contains both a criticism of Brunner's ethics and the statement of a position opposed to it. One might add that Hill's list of references in theological works is very meager. Perhaps it is unfair to criticize him at this point, for his purpose in this text is certainly not to cover the field of theological ethics.

If instructors in philosophy are not ill-disposed to Moore's view of ethics, and want both a study of theories and a constructive approach, they should find this text quite useful. Hill's bibliographies are very good, and with each chapter he includes a list of suggested readings.

William H. K. Narum

Rand McNally Bible Atlas. By Emil G. Kraeling. New York: Rand McNally & Company, 1956. 487 pages. $8.95.

This comprehensive guide to the study of the Bible has been prepared by one of America's leading biblical scholars, who has spent many years in intensive research into the best original sources, including very recent archaeological discoveries. It presents fresh insights into the background of the biblical materials from Genesis to Revelation in a chronological scheme carefully designed to indicate the historical and geographical relevance of the records.

The first two chapters deal with the land of the Bible. The next fifteen cover the Old Testament period under five major headings, "The Ancient Hebrew Tradition," "The Promised Land," "The Great Kings," "The Divided Kingdom," and "Babylon to Jerusalem." Chapters XVIII to XXII cover the New Testament period under two major

headings, "The Time of Jesus" and "The Growth of Christianity."

In elucidating the materials Dr. Kraeling reveals his skill as a linguist, archaeologist, historian, biblical scholar, and writer. Along with his brother, Carl H. Kraeling, director of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, who wrote the preface to the volume, the author enjoys an enviable reputation as an authority in the field. Whatever the Kraelings issue commands universal attention and respect among biblical scholars.

For the most part Dr. Kraeling follows the traditional arrangement of the biblical books, although he adapts his scheme to suit his purpose in presenting the best results of research into biblical chronology. Into the history of the Kings he introduces references to parallel accounts in the Chronicles and the Prophets, and in dealing with the New Testament period he concentrates largely on Mark and Acts as providing the basic background.

Particularly instructive in the text are the references to recent archaeological discoveries, such as the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Nebuchadnezzar Chronicle, and numerous other evidences bearing on the background of the Bible. While the author's interest is primarily historical and geographical, he shows himself to be well informed on matters of literary criticism and here and there introduces judgments on critical issues which are incisive and sane. His treatment of the seven cities addressed in Revelation, no less than of numerous places in Old Testament history, is fresh and instructive.

Greatly enhancing the value of this atlas are the forty pages (225-264) of new full color maps, some three hundred photographs derived from numerous sources, original illustrations drawn by artist Sue Allen, sketch maps, an analytical table of contents, and complete geographic and subject indices. All of these aids, together with the covering text, make this the most modern reference work of its kind. It is a complete, accurate, convenient, and up-to-date guide to an understanding of biblical geography and history. It should be in every public library and on the desk of every Bible student.

E. E. Flack

The Interpreter's Bible. Volume 11: Philippians to Hebrews. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1955, 763 pages. $8.75.

Like the others in this series, this volume contains a wide selection of biblical reflection and preaching. For anyone who accepts the premise that the preacher is an interpreter of the Word of God to his own day, there is a multitude of genuinely helpful reflections on the Scriptures. There are at least two different perspectives for each text. For anyone who preaches weekly to the same congregation, there are fresh and constructive sermon materials and applications. One would not call the commentary definitive, but it is very useful.

E. F. Scott introduces Philippians as sent from Rome, of uncertain date, and definitely Pauline. He finds the chief purpose in the practical need of assuring Epaphroditus a good reception as a messenger of Paul. He continually emphasizes the practical over against the theological values of the epistle. The exposition, by Robert Wicks, is rather longer than most of the books; he places a key emphasis on the doctrine of the incarnation in his interpretation.

Francis Beare, of Trinity College, Toronto, presents extensively the various possible locations for the preparation of the Epistle to the Colossians, then proceeds to find the arguments for Pauline authorship unsatisfactory, the arguments against it insufficient, and concludes that Paul should be identified as author without much use of his personal history for interpretation. The expositor, G. Preston MacLeod, emphasizes the theological insights and their relevance rather than specific preaching materials.

John Bailey concludes for Pauline authorship of I and II Thessalonians. He shows a good appreciation of Old Testament allusions and sources. On I Thess. 4:13-18 there are splendid references to the sources of the imagery. James W. Clarke prepared the exposition. There is a stimulating three-point sermon on I Thess. 1:1. The accent throughout is on practical exhortation to Christian living.

Fred Gealy prepared the introduction and exegesis of the Pastorals. After clearly facing the necessity of choosing a single solu-

tion to the historical problems of the Pastorals, he frankly states that he accepts the theory of pseudonymity. He also accepts as probable that fragments of genuinely Pauline material are included in them. There is a splendid discussion on the heresies of the early church: Jewish, Christian, Gnostic, and Marcionite. Of great interest is a brief essay on "The Nature of Pseudonymity" in which he points out the service it rendered in defending and transmitting genuinely Pauline Christianity in an era of serious heresies. In the exposition by Morgan Noyes one of the better essays is on the famous "husband of one wife" of I Timothy.

Philemon is introduced and exegeted by John Knox. He clearly demonstrates the authenticity and uniqueness af the book. For purposes of comparison he quotes a letter of Pliny asking for manumission of a slave; then he comes to the fresh insight that Paul's deeper purpose in this letter is to secure the slave Onesimus for his own service. He further uncovers a striking connection between Philemon and the Epistle of Ignatius from the early second century and suggests the fresh and stimulating hypothesis that Paul's Onesimus is the same bishop of Ephesus to whom Ignatius writes. This hypothesis explains further how such a personal note as Philemon would be preserved and placed in the canon.

Alexander C. Purdy prepared the introduction and exegesis of Hebrews. His outline is serviceable, though a bit pedantically divided into argument, application, and exhortation. There is a superior section on the "Religious Ideas of Hebrews"; his chief point is that a two-story view of reality controls "the whole thought of Hebrews"—"on the ground floor the shadowy, transient, fugitive events and institutions; in the upper story the permanent, perfect realm of reality." In addition to the obvious Old Testament source of the author's thinking, Purdy presents the background in Platonic idealism and the relations with Hellenism and Hellenistic Judaism, along with Philo. The bibliography omits Manson's book, and the early date of most of the commentaries goes to show that there is a fertile field for research in Hebrews.

The exposition of Hebrews is by J. Harry Cotton, who opens with a statement that might be used to introduce the whole series: "the task of the interpreter is to mediate between the Word of God and the affairs, the affections, the thoughts, and the world of his hearers." There is a large number of quotations from hymns and poetry, many from Browning. Each of the persons mentioned in the famous Hebrews 11 is used to illustrate a different dimension of faith; they would make a splendid series of Lenten sermons—for example, Sarah, the faith of the hard-headed.

This volume, like the others, covers a wide range of outlooks and material; it is sometimes ordinary, often above average, and occasionally very stimulating.

VERNON P. FAILLETTAZ

Preaching on the Books of the New Testament. By Dwight E. Stevenson. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956. 262 pages. $3.95.

Expository preaching acquires a big thrust from this volume by the professor of Homiletics in the College of the Bible at Lexington, Kentucky. Dissatisfied with the traditional topical preaching and the usual "textual" preaching, Dr. Stevenson calls for a "redigging of the wells of biblical preaching." He asks for a preaching that will enable men to acquire faith and grow in it. The deep sources of this religion he finds in theology, the devotional life, and the Bible.

This volume seeks to present not only an appeal for the use of the Bible in preaching but a technique for accomplishing it. The author believes that there is a way of preaching intelligently and interestingly upon whole books of the New Testament. His method is essentially that of the expository sermon applied to an entire book. After laying down certain basic and guiding principles he proceeds to study and present examples of the treatment of the several books of the New Testament. In each instance the procedure is the same. It begins with an extensive background study of the book to be preached on. The "cardinal" idea of the book is derived and studied. Examples of the development of the preaching outline are presented. A modern title is assigned and relevant applications are noted. Something of the spirit

of the work may be seen in such titles as "The Teacher Sent from God—Matthew," "Strong Son of God—Mark," "Our Eternal Contemporary—John," "The March of the Gospel—Acts," "The Great Redemption—Romans," "Blueprint for Doomsday, Second Thessalonians."

One who has been pleading for a larger use of the Bible in preaching cannot but welcome the contribution of this able preacher. What he does here is unique. His background studies are sound, though limited. His distillation of the book's message is vital and valid. His technique of sermon building is good. His applications are relevant. He opens a field that may well be explored with profit by modern preachers.

Possibly this method, preaching upon an entire book, is open to several criticisms. Even for so skilled an exponent as Dr. Stevenson, it seems to compress too much material in too small a space. The preacher can easily allow his sermon to become overextended. Or he may neglect certain vital phases of the book in order to keep within his outline. It requires unusual skill and long practice to attain the results set forth in this volume of examples. But in the main the author does a real service to the Christian pulpit and contributes to modern preaching a valuable instruction.

HARRY F. BAUGHMAN

Why I Am a Lutheran. By Victor Emanuel Beck. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1956. 180 pages. $2.75.

This is the second volume in the series that began with Roy L. Smith's *Why I Am a Methodist,* a series that is intended to present the story of the bodies that comprise Protestantism.

This reviewer, a home missionary in Oklahoma (a territory that the Lutheran immigrants did not discover in large numbers), finds the author's approach wise, interesting, and effective. The reviewer has also been in areas where Lutherans are more prominent, and in his attempts there to win the unchurched from among those of non-Lutheran culture, he also found his missionary efforts inhibited because Lutheranism was suspect (due to lack of information on its history) with regard to its "foreign" character and supposed connection with the Roman Catholic Church. While the Lutheran Church is now paying more and more attention to "public relations," we can realize that it has had "public relations" all along, some of it negative. Why is it that the non-churched in our land, when approached in a church survey, know for sure that of all churches, they most certainly do not go to a Lutheran church! If the canvasser is persistent (the space has to be filled in with something), well, maybe they'd go to a Methodist or a Presbyterian church. Why do those churches have that "good will?" Why does the Lutheran Church, the third largest Protestant denomination in our country, have this resistance in the public mind?

Dr. Beck's book, although not mentioning this problem, meets it head-on by beginning with a recital of life in his home community, a Swedish Lutheran settlement in southern Minnesota, then unashamedly digging up the foreign roots of Lutheranism. The first three chapter heads show this approach: My Home Community, Beginnings of Lutheranism in America, Across the Atlantic. Incidentally, the non-churched non-Lutheran also has heard faintly about all those different "sign-odds," and he feels there must be something inherently evil in the apparent disunity of American Lutheranism. Beck's procedure, which places this matter in sociology more than in theology (p. 26), is helpful also for the missionary pastor in overturning the road-blocks which hinder him from bringing his real message of Christ.

Chapter Four, "A Soul and a Book," shows concisely the beginnings of Lutheranism in the struggle of Luther's conscience for peace with God. Chapter Five, "The Reformation," among other things explains the conservative character of the Lutheran movement in contrast with the Reformed tradition, showing its practical effect on American Lutheran church life, especially in regard to liturgical matters (that which hooks us with the Roman Church in the opinion of the man-in-the-street whom, uninformed as he is, we are still trying to reach). The brief treatment of the Lutheran concept of the "adiaphoron" can also serve this correspondent from the "Bible Belt" who has been welcomed into the homes of several formerly

of the Southern Baptist, Church of Christ, or Pentecostal groups, people who have reacted against their stringent "blue laws."

A. C. Rueter

Come as You Are. By O. H. Austin. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956. 110 pages. $1.50.

This book is much different from the usual run of devotional books. The author received an award in a religious radio workshop sponsored by the National Council of Churches. This volume represents material first collected for his popular program, "A Story to Tell." Austin is a Presbyterian clergyman. In addition to experience in the parish ministry, he has served as minister to students at Indiana University, as a Protestant chaplain in a Federal penitentiary, and later as the institutional chaplain with the Louisville (Ky.) Council of Churches.

The devotions are of the "life-situation" type. The reviewer's opinion is that the work is effectively done. After all, to start with a text may or may not insure that the devotion is Bible-based, and it may or may not guarantee interest and penetration into the reader's soul. Austin's technique arrests attention and brings the reader into Scripture. The devotional with the unlikely title, "Somebody Kick Me," directs the reader into his need for repentance and faith. "What Happened to the Cow?" leads one into the hymn, "What a Friend We Have in Jesus."

A. C. Rueter

Climbing the Heights. Daily Devotions. Compiled by Al Bryant. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing Co., 1956. 382 pages. $2.50.

Arranged day by day according to the calendar, these devotions consist of a brief verse of Scripture, a meditation by some preacher or commentator of the past or present (from Luther and Spurgeon to Bob Jones and Billy Graham), and often a concluding stanza of a hymn or popular religious poem. The style is predominantly hortative.

The New Testament: A Survey. By Merrill C. Tenney. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1953. 474 pages. $5.50.

The author of this volume serves as dean of the Wheaton College Graduate School, having previously served as professor of New Testament at both Gordon College of Theology and Missions, in Boston, and at Wheaton College.

He sets as his primary task a survey presentation of the total New Testament world scene—social, economic, political, and religious—in which historical context the New Testament writings may be seen in their fullest significance. At the same time, he is concerned with their timeless message for the spiritual needs of every generation.

This publication is particularly designed as a textbook for the college or seminary classroom in the area of New Testament survey. Suggested outlines for each of the books, and a variety of tabulated appendix material add utility for such use. In harmony with his intent, the writer wisely restricts the treatment of introductory technical problems in order to keep central focus on the content of the writings. Extensive bibliographical helps direct the reader with more specialist interest to ampler discussion of these matters elsewhere.

One would expect a volume unofficially representing Wheaton College to incorporate conservative presuppositions; such expectations are consistently confirmed. In the matter of authorship of the Gospels, for example, Mr. Tenney accepts, without dogmatizing, the traditional author-assignment in each case. In crediting the Fourth Gospel to the Apostle John, there is not even reference made to the unavoidably qualifying testimony of chapter 21. In a brief, nontechnical summary of the Synoptic problem he offers no solutions, rather maintaining a skeptical disposition over against the proposals of all the source analysts.

He effectively considers the epistolary writings (beginning with the Letter of James and Paul's Letter to the Galatians) as integrated parts of the story of the establishment and development of the early church. Thereby he materially aids the reader in maintaining a sense of the histor-

ical context out of which and for which the literature was produced. For example, the Pastorals (all confidently assigned to Paul) are introduced in a delineation of "The Institutional Church"; a consideration of I Peter comes in a chapter devoted to "The Suffering Church"; "The Peril of Heresies" is the chapter heading which focuses attention on II Peter, Jude, and I, II, and III John. While any such stereotyping organizational system runs some calculated risks (must not the total picture of heretical development in the early church include other literary testimony, and preeminently that of Colossians?), it nonetheless is a helpful device, serving to supplement the obvious authorship-association with the more meaningful relationship of the writings to the contemporary "church situation."

It is worth noting that Tenney's analysis of the book of Revelation maintains an impartial objectivity throughout. He presents in essence the four main "schools" of interpretation and explains the millennial alternatives but leaves the reader to make his own choice. His only personal commitment on the controversial historical issue finds expression in the undefined statement, "Revelation thus belongs partially to the past, partially to the present, and partially to the future" (p. 412). A disappointment for this reviewer is the failure of the author to see, or at least suggest, the significance of the dramatic structure for an understanding of the Apocalypse.

Despite its considerable length, this volume is in no sense a commentary on the New Testament. Rather it is a study aid for complete New Testament surveying purposes. College, and even first-year seminary, courses devoted to total New Testament coverage would find it quite helpful, either as text or occasional reference work. The 100-page introduction to "The World of the New Testament" provides a very adequate setting for a study of the church and its literature. Pastors conducting Bible study groups would find "refresher" benefit in consulting Tenney's presentation of the background, content, suggested outline, and evaluation of a given book.

We especially commend this volume for its simple fluency, its consistent adherence to purpose, and its vital and evangelical dealing with revelation.

T. S. Liefeld

Introduction to New Testament Study. By Donald T. Rowlingson. New York: Macmillan Company, 1956. 246 pages. $3.95.

Here is a book which accomplishes splendidly exactly what its title indicates as the aim: to introduce college and seminary students, pastors, and laymen to the New Testament, especially its contents, in light of current biblical studies. And, pleasant exception, the style is simple and the concern practical enough that the "average reader" to whom so much theological writing is beamed today need not be a miniature Barth or Brunner to understand what the author is talking about!

Professor Rowlingson, of the Boston University School of Theology, begins with the all-important question of the goal and presuppositions of New Testament study. Relevance to our problems and needs and an appreciation of Jesus and his influence are the goals he suggests so that the New Testament must become a "Jesus Book" with a message for readers today. The presuppositions he champions are the historical approach and a need for religious sensitivity. Methods for Bible study based on the historical approach are provided with illustration so that the reader can then go on on his own.

The discussion of Jesus in the Gospels is especially good. Not only is the reader introduced to the findings of modern criticism as to how the story of Jesus was preserved, transmitted, and assembled in the primitive church; he is also presented with a thumb-nail sketch of the picture of Jesus which each gospel as we have it presents. There is insistence on the point that twentieth century scholarship has made quite clear that we cannot write a biography of Jesus in the literal sense, for our gospel sources were not penned as biographies of a great man but as witness literature to a Saviour. On the other hand, the author also insists that we must use these records as fully as possible to come to know the Lord they seek to present. If no unambig-

uous historical Jesus can be reconstructed, nonetheless the "most important aspects of his personality and message can be discovered" (p. 83), and must be!

Acts and the letters of Paul are treated as evidence for the life and thought of the first Christian generation, though the Pauline epistles, it may be added, often get briefer treatment as to contents than other books do —which is perhaps just the way most readers deal with them. Hebrews, I Peter, and Revelation are analyzed as "Reactions to Persecution," James, the Pastorals, John's letters, Jude, and II Peter provide evidence of "Consolidation of the Ranks" within the church against threatening heresies. One chapter touches briefly upon Marcion and the later developments that went into the making of the New Testament canon, and the author's practical, life concern is indicated by a closing epilogue on "The Contemporary Christ and New Testament Study."

Excellent bibliographies with notes suggest further readings for each section and the shade of opinion each book represents. Prof. Rowlingson's own position, clearly delineated, is best characterized as evangelical, with no bias for any single school of New Testament research and an appreciation for the work of liberal and conservative alike. A series of appendices covers references outside the New Testament to early Christian origins, a collection of passages hard to find elsewhere; chronologies; and a fine guide for a study in the New Testament on the life of Paul. Leadership classes may find this helpful book a worthwhile text.

JOHN REUMANN

The Prophets. By Julius A. Bewer. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955. 663 pages. $5.95.

This is not a book which a person would sit down and read from cover to cover. Since 1949 a series of monographs has appeared from the pen of the late Julius A. Bewer. They have contained a brief historical and literary introduction to the different prophetic books of the Old Testament. Then they have reproduced the King James text of the respective books with interpretive notes at the bottom of each page. These monographs on the Old Testament prophetic books have been brought together now in a single volume.

In the technical sense, this volume cannot be called an exegetical commentary. This would necessitate more attention to the historical situation to which the prophet spoke as the author progresses from chapter to chapter and the covenant purpose which Yahweh was anxious to carry forward in the historical periods of the respective prophets. When the King James version is not clear, the author sets forth at the bottom of the page his own translation on the basis of the Massoretic text. His notes give an accurate and helpful explanation of the figurative and poetic language which the prophets employ but which is foreign to the modern reader. The author has realized his objective, which is to supply the modern man with a tool which will assist him in the intelligent reading of the prophets. The work is not intended to be a detailed commentary.

The historical introductions are brief but provide valuable and accurate information. As the author discusses the literary structure and formation of the book, he discloses his thorough-going critical approach. If scholarship is to be objective, which it must be or it is worthless, then it must be critical. However, the author does not set forth the view which is in the ascendancy today, that the individual prophetic books as we have them now are essentially an anthology of the messages which the prophet spoke and wrote. Rather he contends that extensive portions of the respective books have been added by later anonymous authors. If we were to view the book as an anthology, we would expect portions from different messages which the prophet spoke and wrote under different circumstances to be found within a single chapter. When the message of the prophet changes suddenly to another subject within a single chapter, this then is not an immediate indication that the separate unit of verses within this chapter has been added by other men who lived in a later period.

JOHN V. HALVORSON

Saint Peter. By John Lowe. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956. 65 pages. $2.50.

This scholarly work is based on a series of lectures delivered at the General Theological Seminary in New York on the William Copley Winslow Memorial Foundation. The author was professor of New Testament Language and Literature in Trinity College, Toronto, and since 1939 has been dean of Christ Church, Oxford.

In three concise chapters Lowe examines the evidence back of the traditions about St. Peter. In Chapter I, which deals with "Peter the Apostle," he observes that although there are about 180 separate references to Peter in the New Testament concordance, what we know about him is beclouded by ecclesiastical controversy. Catholic and Protestant thought about him reveals wild discord. The author proceeds to point out a mediating position, which he regards as tenable on the basis of a critical examination of the evidence. Peter, he holds, was not learned in the way that the rabbis were. He could hardly have produced I Peter, much less II Peter. Still he held an outstanding place as the first-named apostle in every list and the head of the Jerusalem church before Jesus came to occupy that position. He was the "Rock" mentioned by our Lord in the account of Matt. 16:17. Because of his leadership the pillars in Jerusalem sent him forth as head of the Jewish mission, while Paul and Barnabas were entrusted with the mission to the Gentiles. This high trust took him away from the scene, and thus James became the head of the church in Jerusalem. Due to his absence from this center, his portrait in the accounts is left "in a kind of twilight"; still Acts offers better testimony than I Peter.

Chapter II deals with "Peter the Martyr." That the apostle suffered a sacrificial death the author considers certain. The evidence is cumulative. Recent excavations in Rome support the early traditions and "come close to demonstrating that a memorial monument to St. Peter existed here in the last half of the second century" (p. 43). However, it is going too far to assert dogmatically that the human bones discovered are those of the apostle.

Relative to "The Primacy of Peter," which Lowe discusses in Chapter III, there is wide divergence of opinion. The exegesis of Matt. 16:17 f. must be explored apart from the dogmatic conclusions of Rome. While Peter is the Rock upon which the Jerusalem church was built, the passage gives no support to the theory of an apostolic succession in the sense that Peter transmitted Roman papal power to his successors. Neither the New Testament nor the apostolic church knows anything of this claim. "A pawn in the polemical game," Peter must be viewed in the light of the evidence.

The book is scholarly, concise, and instructive. It merits wide perusal.

E. E. Flack

The Teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews. By Geerhardus Vos. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1956. 124 pages. $2.00.

This book is neither a commentary nor a systematic attempt at a biblical theology based on the Epistle to the Hebrews; it consists of lecture notes from a seminary classroom, edited and in a measure rewritten by the author's son after his father's death. To the present reviewer, who was privileged to hear these lectures in the classroom thirty years ago, this origin suggests both the strength and the weakness of this unpretentious little volume. Its strength is this, that it shows a careful exegete and teacher at work, studying the biblical text, analyzing key words, thoughts, and sentences in the Epistle, and making this analysis the basis for a few theological interpretations, fragmentary in form but far-reaching in significance. The author does not make the mistake of trying to be a theologian without first being an exegete. In this respect the book brings to life again vivid impressions first received in the classroom. Dr. Vos was both exegete and biblical theologian, but he never left the student in doubt that there can be no correct theology without the most careful exegesis of the biblical text from which the theology is drawn. The book is a useful reminder of a procedure which we

in our impatience for "short-cuts" in the area of biblical teaching frequently forget. But it must be admitted that the author's methodical analysis, his painstakingly careful weighing of the pro and con with respect to both translation and interpretation, and his often tentative rather than final conclusions do not seem quite as satisfying as they did in the classroom.

In spite of editing, the book remains essentially "lecture notes"; and that is its weakness. It is not a fatal weakness, however. The book will reward the reader with some fine insights into the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews. It will acquaint him with "the progressive character of revelation" (p. 68) through the comparison of the Old Covenant and the New. It may introduce him, as the original lectures did me, to the importance of the "covenant" (the *berith* or *diatheke*) in biblical religion. It is worth the price of the book if it does no more than impress the reader with the truth that biblical exegesis must precede biblical theology.

J. P. Milton

The Pulpit Rediscovers Theology. By Theodore O. Wedel. Greenwich, Conn.: Seabury Press, 1956. 181 pages. $3.50.

"Dedicated to the memory of the Right Rev. George Craig Stewart, . . . who gave to the pulpit its rightful authority in the common life of the people of God." This volume, I said, had better be good—so much do I owe to this "bishop of Chicago" who walked erect and unafraid through the storms of theological controversy when so many were floundering and cowering. I knew that Canon Wedel would be "up to it," and he is.

The chapters move swiftly, and always with assurance: Our Bewildered Pulpit; Christ—Master or Saviour?; A Clue to Biblical Theology; Faith and "The Faith"; The Pulpit, the Font, and the Altar; and "The Community of Faith as the Agent of Salvation." For some of us who have lived through most of the momentous happenings in the religious world during the past thirty years, much of the material will be a review —but what a review! Here is a story that gives the essentials of drama-packed days when historians reluctantly give way to theologians. "The rediscovery of the verb-theology of the Bible is still something of a novelty in many schools, and even more in the pulpit. It will take us all some time to embody in our preaching its profound significance."

Some may squirm at such statements as "Between the breakdown of biblical literalism and the contemporary emergence of biblical theology," and "We need not mourn the passing of the era of biblicist orthodoxy," but let them bravely read on. If nothing else happens, the reader will be compelled to ask himself searching questions about what he is preaching as well as what goals he is making for, and this will do us all nothing but good. If we can recover or "rediscover the power of dogmatic preaching," the church will become the church.

Theodore Heimarck

The Christian Faith. By David H. C. Read. New York: Scribners, 1956. 175 pages. $1.95.

This is a good book, and well worthy of recommendation both to clergy and lay folk. It is written for those who want to know what the Christian faith is as a system of thought and as a spur to action. By way of introduction, Dr. Read sets forth his intention to *explain* rather than to commend the Christian faith, saying also: "I hope that I have kept in mind the wider inheritance of the Church Catholic and that the book will be acceptable as an expression of the essential content of that which Christians hold in common."

In language of arresting style, Dr. Read introduces his readers to a series of eight chapters, every one well prepared and challenging. In connection with the basis of belief there is suggested three "credentials of Christianity," the church, the Bible, and "the really vital credential, the inner conviction in his heart that these things are so." Each is said to be the corrective of the other, the three being mutually illuminating.

Following this fine chapter, the author then presents his material under headings which include studies on Christ, self-disclosure of God, the Cross and its signif-

icance for our salvation and sanctification, an excellent study of the Trinity (the doctrine grows out of the experience of the church), the church and its sacraments, and a chapter on final destiny.

E. J. Erlandson

Christian Doctrine. By John Mackintosh Shaw. New York: Philosophical Library, 1954. 377 pages. $6.00.

In the preface of this book the author states a threefold purpose for having written this work: (1) "to think out afresh the great vital convictions of our Christian faith back of their traditional doctrinal expression," (2) "to realize anew the wonder of them," (3) "and express them in terms which shall be relevant and meaningful for the living thought and conduct of the present." He also states that he has set for himself a "twofold end": "promote an intelligent loyalty to the Christian faith on the part of those already within the Christian church, and set forth plainly to those outside the church what the Christian faith and the Christian church stand for." It is the opinion of this reviewer that Dr. Shaw accomplishes his purposes with a marked degree of success. This does not mean, however, that the reviewer agrees with the positions taken by the author. In order to "promote an intelligent loyalty," as Dr. Shaw calls it, he seems to rely upon, and appeal to, the human reason and plausible explanations more than upon Christian faith, which while not irrational certainly goes beyond the plausible. Dr. Shaw's style of writing is so clear and readable that one has to be constantly on one's guard not to become so enamoured of the way it is said as to fail to read critically what is said.

G. F. Schott

The Jews from Cyrus to Herod. By Norman H. Snaith. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956. 208 pages. $2.50.

A brief account of the Jewish people in the post-exilic and inter-testamental periods, this work is intended for pastor and student, not for the specialist. There is little fresh research involved, rather synthesis of such results of modern study as will be useful to the preacher and general biblical student.

Beyond doubt, such a handbook is needed, for this period after the return from exile is the time when "Judaism," the religious background of Jesus and his contemporaries, was formed. The historical scene against which the story of Jesus is told cannot be understood without reference to this period. Neither can many of the key concepts of the preaching of Jesus and of the New Testament be understood apart from it. We may think of "Kingdom of God," "Son of Man," "New Age," and many others, concepts given their meaning by their use in this time. To the extent, then, that Dr. Snaith achieves his purpose, his book must be given hearty recommendation.

The book is divided into two sections, the first dealing with "The Historical Background," the second with "The Religious Development." Of these, the first is the most uniformly successful. It is a brief and lucid picture of a thoroughly confusing period. In the second section the author discusses "The Restoration," "Separatism," "The Glorious Future," "Messiah," "Life After Death," "Demons and Angels," "The Law," "Wisdom," "The Logos," "Temple and Synagogue," "Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes." A glance at this list will show how central is the material with which he deals. In general, the treatments are satisfactory. Especially good is his discussion of these subjects as they appear in the apocalyptic and other inter-testamental literature. The importance of these writings as background for the New Testament is great, yet a good overview of them is hard to find.

There is, however, one objection which must be made to Snaith's viewpoint in this section. He tends, it seems to me, greatly to exaggerate the distinction between pre- and post-exilic Israel. There is no doubt that the experience of the exile was of fundamental importance in shaping the life and thought of Jewry. But Snaith seems to trace almost every significant factor in post-exilic thought to this experience, leaving little connection between the faith of monarchical Israel and Judaism.

In large part this derives from his handling of the sources. At some points he does not distinguish between the critically established date of a literary source and the

date of its contents. The Priestly Code (P) is post-exilic; very well, so are the practices uniquely described therein. Snaith thus remains within the methods and results of the older criticism, apparently taking little account of the work of the more recent "history-of-tradition" investigators, such as Mowinckle, Alt, or Weiser. These men have shown us how an Old Testament "source" is not a suddenly-appearing literary production, but one step in a long stream of tradition, oral and written, so that the dates of items in the contents of a source may extend back for generations before the date of its literary fixation.

To give one example: Speaking of circumcision, he says, quite correctly, that originally "it was a puberty rite," which in a development peculiar to the Hebrews "became a mark in the flesh which separated the Jew off from other peoples." But then he goes on to say, "This is all post-exilic" (pp. 80-81). This is so, he claims, because the story of the institution of the rite in Genesis 17:1-14 is from P, which is post-exilic. The other references in Exodus 4:26 and Joshua 5:2-9 (J and D) he is thus forced to make refer to a puberty rite and not a covenant-rite, certainly a strained interpretation.

Other examples of the method could be given. Occasionally, therefore, the second part of this book must be used with discretion. On the whole, however, this work of a more than competent scholar fills a definite need and is warmly recommended.

ROBERT W. JENSON

Mastery. By E. Stanley Jones. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1955. 364 pages. $1.75.

The subtitle of this book is "The Art of Mastering Life," a favorite theme of the author. His thesis is stated in the Introduction as follows: "A group of ordinary people were mastered by the risen Christ moving into them in the Holy Spirit; and thus mastered they moved out to master their circumstances and their relationships into a miniature Kingdom of God. It is Mastery, within and without."

The experiences of the first Christian community as recorded in Acts thus provides the biblical ground for the development of his thesis; the book however is in no sense a commentary on Acts. Some of the topics dealt with are mastery of religious paraphernalia, of social and race distinctions, of the material, of sex, of negativism, of all kinds of complexes, fears, jealousies, etc.

The make-up of the book follows the pattern of the author's other devotional books, a page for each day. The reviewer did not find that plan very satisfactory due to the nature of the subject. The discussion of some topics, taking a page a day, continues for several days or a week, whereas they would be more helpful if studied at one time. Of course, one can read the book in larger sections, but the daily arrangement with a certain amount of necessary repetition discourages one from doing so.

The most serious objections to this book will be found in the author's attitude to the sacraments and the Creed, which he regards as "aids" and "not essential." Thus we find such statements as: "The rite of baptism, no longer a necessity, became beautifully useful in proclaiming outwardly an already inward fact" (p. 34). Similarly, he makes light of creeds, maintaining that all a person needs is Jesus Christ. The only creed necessary is the first and simplest creed, "Jesus is Lord." On the basis of this brief creed, he pleads strongly for a union of all churches in one federal union.

MAURICE S. MOLVIK